A PRESERVATIVE

Against the

CHANGE OF RELIGION:

OR, A

Just and true Idea of the *Roman* Catholick Religion, opposed to the Flattering Portraictures made thereof, and particularly to that of my Lord of *Condom*.

Translated out of the French Original, by CLAUDIUS GILBERT, *Batchelor of Divinity, and Minister of* Belfast.

LONDON,

Printed by *S. Roycroft*, for *Thomas Cockerill* at the *Three Legs* in the *Poultrey*, 1683.

07 - 134

'72 - 1507

TO THE

Worſhipful Soveraign,

AND THE

BURGESSES

OF THE

Borough of *Belfaſt*,

AND

To the Inhabitants thereof.

Chriſtian Friends,

THis Learned Piece was lately brought to my Hand by a Signal Providence,

in its Native *French* Dreſs. By the renewed peruſal thereof; I found it to be very Subſtantial and Seaſonable, which made me willing to render it more uſeful, by Publiſhing it in our Vulgar Habit. It hath been found to be of ſingular Service in its Native Country, and may be ſo among us likewiſe, through God's Bleſſing. Whilſt ſo many Thouſand of our Neighbours Houſes are daily Fired, it's time for All to awake. The multiplied Perſecutions of the *Proteſtants* in *France*, ſo cauſeleſly renewed of late, ſhould rowze up all Chriſtians round about them. In

In such Infectious Times, a Choice *ANTIDOTE* should be valued and desired of All. Many Reasons might oblige me to recommend this Present to your View and Improvement: The choice Ingredients thereof were very Skilfully Composed, and Faithfully Dispensed by the Learned Author thereof. My Zealous Affections for all Your Prosperous Welfare, chiefly in *Spirituals*, and for the Common Interest of all *Christians*, have perswaded Me to this Publication, which I desire cordially to commend to the Blessing of the Most High

High, as becomes the Function and Relation of,

Your Faithfully Devoted in the Lord Jesus, for the best Service,

Belfast, July 3. 1682.

CLAUDIUS GILBERT.

THE

THE CONTENTS OF THE ARTICLES Contained in this BOOK.

ARTICLE I.

General Reflexions upon my Lord of Condom's *Book*, pag. 19

Article II.

A General Idea *of both Religions*, p. 36

Article

Article III.

That we agree not about Fundamental Points, p.45

Article IV.

That the Worship forbidden of God, cannot terminate in him, p.53

Article V.

Of the Invocation of the Saints, p.56

Article VI.

Of Images and Relicks, p.78

Article VII.

Of Justification, and Merit of Works, p.87

Article VIII.

Of Satisfactions, Indulgences, and Purgatory, p.101

Article IX.

Of Sacraments in General, p.115

Article

The Contents.

Article X.

Of the Euchariſt, of Real Preſence, and of Tranſubſtantiation, p.120

Article XI.

Of the Adoration of the Hoſt, p.137

Article XII.

Of the Sacrifice of the Maſs, p.152

Article XIII.

Of the Retranchment of the Cup, p.165

Article XIV.

Of Holy Scripture, p.176

Article XV.

Of the Church, p.182

Article XVI.

Of the Pope, and of his Authority, p.189

Article

Article XVII.

Of the Points which Monſieur de Condom *hath forgotten; Of the Worſhip in an Unknown Tongue; Of the Multitude of Ceremonies; Of Maſſes without Communicants; Of forced Celibat,* p.198

A PRESERVATIVE Againſt the Change of Religion; OR, A juſt and true Idea of the Catholick *Roman* Religion, oppoſed to the flattering Portraicture, which is made thereof; and particularly to that of my Lord of *Condom.*

NEver were greater Efforts in *France* to effect what they call *Converſions*, and never was the Truth attack'd by ſo many Means, nor fought with ſo much Succeſs. We ſee nothing elſe every where, but Scandalous falls; therefore they that lay to heart their Salvation. ought to be furniſhed beforehand againſt the Contagion of this ill Air, that reigns at this day. It's time to awake when the houſe is burning; and one may ſay, that if the Zeal of our Reformed in *France* be not kindled

anew, they are next to the ſeeing the ruine of their whole Party. The Book of my Lord of *Condom* is one of the Means which is uſed with moſt Succeſs, to delude thoſe Spirits that are Wavering, and whereof the Piety is ill fixed. Theſe Gentlemen have ſo high an Opinion of that Work, and of what it can do, that many Biſhops cauſe it to be printed at their own Coſt, and to be diſtributed within their Dioceſs to all conſiderable Proteſtants there. The Temptation is powerful, and the Method which my Lord of *Condom* hath uſed is dextrous, his Artifices are fine and delicate, and it is certain, that this Book is able to Corrupt the hearts of thoſe that are inclin'd towards the World, and who are ſeeking out ſome Pretences to quit a Religion ſo cruelly attack'd. It is then needful, that all the World ſhould be taught, that every one ſhould keep his Guard well againſt ſuch a Temptation. And as the *Roman* Church labours to ſpread my Lord of *Condom*'s Book through all Europe, by cauſing it to be turn'd into all Languages, we muſt alſo diſperſe through them all the Anſwers oppoſed thereto. And when the Publick ſhall have found one, beſt liked, every Particular Perſon ſhould furniſh himſelf with a Copy thereof, that may be ſtill at hand, and ſtill read over, to be continually upheld againſt ſuch a Temptation, as is never at an end, but is unceſſantly ſtill renewing.

Ever ſince that Loſs, which the *Roman* Church had in the beginning of the laſt Age of ſo many Millions of Souls, which did then ſeparate from her Communion; no Endeavours have been omitted to repair that Breach and no Means but have been employ'd to bring back into her Boſom ſuch as have gone away from it. We muſt needs bear them this Witneſs, that never ſo much Ardor and Zeal was ſeen in any Enterprize; never was a more ſerious and important Affair under-

taken,

taken, than this deſign they have laid to hinder the duration and progreſs of That, which they call *Schiſm* and *Hereſie*. It is indeed a deſign which cannot be blamed. If theſe Gentlemen are well perſwaded, that the Religion, which we have abandon'd, is the only One, that may conduct unto Salvation: We may not wonder, if they labour to bring us back thereto, provided that they endeavour it in a good way, honeſtly, and by a Principle of Charity and true Zeal. But as it often happens, that in ſuch a caſe Men prove the Cullies of their own hearts, and that Self-love, the Intereſt of the Fleſh, and that of the World, do delude them; all ſhould well examine themſelves in that regard, and not take it ill, that they that are concern'd therein be willing to have their part in ſuch an Examination.

We ſhould not imagine, that all that which is called *Zeal for Religion*, and a *deſign to convert Hereticks*, ſhould neceſſarily flow from a good Principle. On the contrary, God, for the Trial of the Faith of his Elect, hath almoſt always permitted, that falſe Religions have had more Zeal for the deſtruction of the True, than the True Religion for the ruine of the Falſer. When Chriſtian Religion became predominant, She did not do that for the ruine of Paganiſm, which had been done againſt her during the Reign of Pagan Emperours. It's true, that true Zeal is always accompanied with Moderation, and falſe Zeal with Violence. So that in the Eyes of Fleſh, the true faithful Ones do appear Luke-warm; and the Enemies of Truth do paſs for true Zealots. When Human Paſſions do mingle themſelves in thoſe Sentiments of Hearts called *Religion*, there is no Exceſs that they are not capable of. In reſpect of other Objects, in the midſt of their greateſt Tranſports they do reproach themſelves ſecretly, which ſtops their fury, and ſteal away ſome part of their Impetuouſneſs; and chiefly

when they are allay'd, and conſider in cold blood their Conduct paſt, they do often accuſe their own ſelves. But contrarily here, Paſſions do ſollicite and animate themſelves, they make Merit of their Violence, and believe that God and his Church are concern'd in their Juſtification; becauſe they imagine, that they have labour'd for the Truth. This is one of the Reaſons why often Men believe, that they ſee but little Zeal in the true Church, while there is ſo much Fire in the Conduct of Them, that endeavour her Ruine.

But we muſt needs grant, that there is ſomething more. The Moderation of the Faithful doth not alway proceed from that Sweet Spirit, which is the very Genius of the Goſpel: It comes often from the coldneſs of their Zeal; God permits it to oblige us to adore in Silence the Myſteries of his Conduct, and to confound at the ſame time the Pride of Mans heart. We have much leſs Love for the Truth, than the World and the Devil have of Hatred againſt it. And whilſt we act in the Eſtabliſhment of Religion by a Principle of Self-love, we have quite another kind of Ardor than when we have no other proſpect than that of the Glory of God. The Church doth eaſily relent; the fervour of the Zeal, which ſeeks the Converſion of Others, doth not laſt long. It is ſo hard a thing to ſeek for Salvation, that Men imagine they do enough to labour for their own, without charging themſelves with the Care of Others. And we eaſily fall into thoſe unhappy Thoughts, That *God is good enough to do his own Buſineſs*; that *he will have a care of his own Intereſt*, and that *he will not want Means to Convert them whom he hath deſtined to eternal Salvation.* Whereas falſe Zeal doth hold it ſelf up, doth perſevere, and finds it ſelf often more capable to endure greater Labours, than the true Devotion.

It

It is a thing that confounds us: I grant it's one of the great Temptations which good Souls are to overcome. But truly, it's a Thing whereof it's impoſſible to deny the Truth, if we have any thing of good Faith or Probity. Our Lord Jeſus Chriſt himſelf doth teach us, that the *Phariſees* and the falſe Doctors of Judaiſm did *compaſs Sea and Land to make a Proſelyte*; and all their labours did conclude to render Him a Son of Hell, like themſelves. All thoſe things do make me conclude, That the Zeal to make Converſions, is not always a certain Sign that the Truth is in that Party. It is a favourable Prejudice; but after all it's but a Prejudice; and we ſhould not ſuffer our ſelves to be conducted by thoſe kinds of Lights, which are often deceitful. We muſt be permitted to examine, If the Zeal of Religion, which cauſes ſo many Emotions, be a Divine fire, or a Paſſion meerly Humane. Now we cannot better know the Nature of that Zeal which ſeeks for Converſions, than by the Meahs which it employs: for it's an indubitable Principle, That *true Piety never doth any ill, that good may come thereof.* She ſeeks the Salvation of Men; but ſhe ſeeks it by ways that are juſt, lawful, and rational.

I. Firſt, It is certain that true Zeal doth never employ for Converſion the *Sword, Fire, Violence* and *Torments*. Thoſe are ill Commentators of the Words of the Lord Jeſus Chriſt, that make him to ſay, *Compel them to come in*, that is to ſay, *Conſtrain them by Violence, and by the fear of Death, to enter into the Church*, which is the Wedding Room. The Lord cannot ſuffer in that Wedding Room, any but ſuch as are clad with the Wedding Garment, and which have a true and ſolid Piety: But thoſe People which are brought into the Church by Fear and Threatnings, are Hypocrites and Impious Perſons, which diſrobe

their Impiety to the sight of Men; Rebels, which feign their Submission, meditate a Revolt, and which always bear the heart of an Enemy. The Church hath suffered many Persecutions, but never did execute any upon others. She overcame Paganism, as Paganism had overcome her before; but she never did retaliate it. She did not use the Authority of *Constantine* and *Theodosius*, to defile the Temples of the False gods with the Blood of their Worshippers, as the Pagans had employ'd the Swords of *Nero*'s, *Maximius*, *Decius* and *Diocletian*'s to bathe the Earth with the Blood of Christians. One must be very ignorant in the History of the Church, not to know, that in all the Contests She had with the *Arrians*, *Eutychians*, and other Hereticks, She used only Exhortations, Reasons, Councils, and other such like Arms. Contrarily, the Hereticks have carried on their Fury against the living Temples of the Holy Ghost; they have employed Sword and Fire, and established themselves, by the help of the Horrour and of the fear of Death, which their Arms did cast into Mens Souls. I know not if there be, at this day, in the Church of *Rome* any honest People, that do not behold those horrid Tragedies which have shed so much Blood in the Ages past; but as so many Accesses of Fury and a phrentick Fever, during which, Christianity arm'd against it self, made it a pleasure and a duty to shed its own Blood, and thrust the cruel Sword into its own Bowels. If mens Souls be to be brought to Christ Jesus by Fear, it must be by the fear of Hell, and by the dread of Gods Judgments; *Knowing*, saith St. *Paul*, *the Terrour of the Lord we perswade men to the Faith*, 2 Cor. 5.

II. *Hope* is also one of the Ways whereby the Souls of Men are more strongly drawn. But to bring Men to Jesus Christ, no other Hope is to be given them, but

but that which the Lord himſelf gives them. One muſt promiſe them exactly what he hath himſelf promiſed them, that is, *Eternal life*; theſe are the Rewards of Heaven. *Whoſoever ſhall forſake Father, Mother, Children, Wife, goods or houſe, he ſhall receive an hundred fold in eternal life.* I find not that he hath preſented any other Objects to Men to perſwade them to come to him. All the World agrees, that nothing is more baſe, than to betray the Truth and ones own Conſcience for Intereſt. *Buy the Truth, and ſell it not*, ſaith the Wiſe man. I ſpeak not only of thoſe Truths which are of the higheſt import, and whereon depends Salvation; I ſpeak of Truth in general. It's one of the richeſt Preſents of Heaven, ſeeing it is to the Soul what Light is to the World; and to renounce it for a baſe Intereſt, it's to deſpiſe God that gave it us. It is to prefer willingly Darkneſs to Light; it's to merit, that God ſhould caſt us into a Reprobate ſenſe, and deprive us of all knowledge of his Truth. Do what men can, they cannot but eſteem ſlightly ſuch as change their Religion for carnal Conſiderations, for a Charge, for a Penſion, and for ſuch like Preferments. It's then clear, that it's not honeſt to ſollicite men to commit baſe and criminal Actions, for which they are afterwards ſlighted. Father *Mainbourg* doth rationally commend *Paul* the Third, who forbad Cardinal *Contarin* to give or promiſe any thing to the Proteſtant Divines, not willing that it might be ſaid, that he had corrupted them with Mony, to bring them by ſo baſe a way to the Belief of the Church, which employs Means much more noble to convert the Strayers. It's hard to believe, that this Author hath not in view ſome Perſons nearer him, than *Paul* the Third, than Cardinal *Contarin*, and the *Lutherans* of the time paſt. The Roman Catholick in *France*, the Proteſtant in *Holland* and in *England*

ſhould never ſay, *Your Religion is an invincible Obſtacle to your Fortune; nothing will be done for you whilſt you are of that Religion.* Methinks the Devil hath rendred this Conduct very ſuſpicious, and Men ſhould think it their point of Honour not to imitate him, and not to ſay as he, *I will give thee the Kingdoms of the world, and their glory.*

III. It ſeems alſo to me, that its but an ill Character in the Zeal that ſeeks Converſions, to be ſo indifferent in the Choice of People. It's true that the Net of the Goſpel Preaching gathers on the Sea-ſhoar all that is found within its compaſs, Dirt, Stones and Pearls; but the Fiſher-man makes his Choice, he takes the Pearls, and throws the reſt into the Water. The true Church doth inclose indeed enough of Prophane and ill Chriſtians, whereof ſhe cannot get rid, becauſe they are born in her boſom. She hath no need to fortifie the ill Party, and increaſe it by receiving the Impious, the Libertines and worldly Profeſſours, which do caſt themſelves into her Arms, only to recover the Reputation that they have loſt, and upon deſign to procure themſelves ſome Protectors againſt the Party, which they have diſhonoured by their Crimes. The Spirit that ſhould conduct men to Jeſus Chriſt, is a Spirit of Purity and of Renunciation to the World; for the Lord ſaith, *If any will follow me, he muſt deny himſelf.* I think therefore, that the true Church ſhould never open her Arms unto ſuch, who have always diſtinguiſhed themſelves by a life full of Diſorders, unleſs ſhe may have good aſſurances that they will renounce Crime as well as Errour. And to be aſſured of that, there muſt be a long Trial. I know well what is ſaid and thought about it. *It's true,* ſay they, *that by theſe ſorts of Converſions we augment not the Number of the Saints, but we leſſen that of the Hereticks: In dimi-*

diminiſhing their Number, they may happily be brought one day to be aſhamed of their Singularity. Their Multitude helps to make them Heady; they perſwade themſelves to be in the right, becauſe they ſee themſelves to be many, who report it ſo one to another. *Theſe ill Converts,* ſay they again, *have Families to be ſaved, they have Children that may be made good Chriſtians; the Stock is naught, but the Branches may be ſanctified.* Whoever Reaſons after this manner, be he Catholick Roman or Proteſtant, aſſuredly reaſons but badly. Although theſe kinds of Reaſoning were not altogether deluſions, yet muſt it needs be granted, that they are Maxims of a Politick purely human; for indeed, the Spirit of Chriſtianiſm doth not commit a preſent Evil for the proſpect of a future Good. He abhors Vice and Crime; he would not be beholding to it for the Salvation of many Souls, though it could be the very occaſion of ſaving ſome. The Church caſts all thoſe dead Carkaſſes on the Shoar, far enough from receiving them into her boſom, under whatſoever pretence.

IV. In fine, *Sincerity* and *good Faith* are, in my Judgment, an inſeparable quality of true Zeal. The Prince of Darkneſs often transforms himſelf into an Angel of Light; but never doth an Angel of Light take the form of the Prince of Darkneſs. Falſhood often abuſes the Truth to ſupport it ſelf; but Truth can never make any good uſe of Falſhood. This is to borrow the Devils Weapons for to fight for Jeſus Chriſt, and that cannot have any good ſucceſs; for there is nothing common between *Chriſt* and *Belial.* It's true, that pious Frauds are no New things: Of a long time have Miracles been fained, Oracles ſuppoſed, and Books publiſhed under the Names of Authors, who were known to have ſome weight with thoſe

whom they had a deſign to convert. It's that which hath given birth to the Oracles of the *Sybils*, to the Books of *Mercurius Triſmegiſtus*, and to the falſe Viſions of the Paſtor, and to ſo many other Deceits, contrived with a good Intention. But this Conduct, though it be ancient, is not therefore become better by growing old: Never will Deceit preſcribe againſt Probity and good Faith. It will always be true, That a Zeal which deceives Men to convert them, is a Zeal that is falſe, ignorant, and miſunderſtood.

There is hardly any kind of Deceit which is not practiſed to fortifie ones own Party, and to diminiſh the oppoſite Party: But here is that which is moſt ordinarily uſed, and with leſs Secrecy. It's that on one ſide, they paint out the Religion, which they would combat, with colours moſt black and hideous; they render it monſtrous, that it may cauſe horrour; they diſſemble what Good it hath, they exaggerate what it hath of Evil; they give a Criminal Character to all its Expreſſions; they make Hereſies of all Tenets; they aſcribe to it what it doth not hold; they diſguiſe, with the hue of *Infidelity*, what it holds. On the other part, they fairly colour the Religion, whereof they undertake the defence; they draw the Curtain on that, which might ſcandalize it; they give an air of Innocency to their moſt criminal Practices; they cover with fair Names the foulſt Things. It's a kind of diſcredit whereof each Party accuſes the oppoſite Party: the Roman Catholick accuſes the Proteſtant, and the Proteſtant accuſes the Roman Catholick. It's a Proceſs that one cannot decide, but by examining to the bottom, to ſee who is in the wrong, and who it is that imputes or imputes not. As I do not here pretend to be unintereſt'd, being a declared Proteſtant, I make no difficulty to pronounce, that our Side is alone in the good Faith; yet will I not be believed upon my

my Word: But the thing is ſo clear, and ſo well known of all the World, that I could ſuppoſe it, without taking the pains to prove it. They have black'd Us with the moſt horrid Imputations, and it's a caſe of ſo great notoriouſneſs, that I know not whether it be poſſible to deny it. There is no Hereſie whereof they would not render us guilty: They have ſaid, that with *Arrius* we deny the Eternity of the Son and his Deity; that with *Neſtorius* we eſtabliſh two Perſons in Jeſus Chriſt; that with *Eutyches* we confound his two Natures. They are two oppoſite Hereſies, and which cannot ſubſiſt together. It matters not, all is well enough, if we be but calumniated. Hath not *Bellarmine* made a Preface to his Book *de Chriſto*, expreſly to prove, that we are *Neſtorians*, *Sabellians*, *Arrians* and *Eutychians*?

Hath not *Gregory* of *Valencia* made a thick Book, *de Unitate & Trinitate*, *Cap.* 8, & 9. againſt the *Lutherans* and the *Calviniſts*? aſſerting, that the *Lutherans* are truly of the Opinion of *Servetus*, and that the *Calviniſts* deny the Divinity of Jeſus Chriſt? And doth not Father *Creſſet* ſay but newly, That *we hate the Virgin, becauſe we hate her Son*? *Part* 1. *Tr.* 1. *p.* 4. In regard of Free Will, they would have Us to be in the Party of the *Manichees*, who ſaid, That *Men were by their Nature determined to good or to evil, and that they are not carried thereto by Choice and by Will.* In regard of Good Works, they attribute to Us the horrid Opinion of the *Gnoſticks*, that ſaid, That *the Spirital man may plunge himſelf into the moſt abominable Crimes of the Fleſh, without fear of the leaſt Pollution, or* ~~*any*~~ *Condemnation.* They ſay, That we deny the neceſſity of Good Works to Salvation; that we make a vile Sinner, after a ſmall act of Faith and Repentance, as juſt as the Holy Virgin,

gin; that we make Men to be Juſt by the Righteouſneſs of another, as if we ſhould make a black Stuff to be white with the whiteneſs of another Stuff; that we do cloath our Juſt man with an imputed Juſtice, under which are hid the moſt horrid moral Impurities; that we lead men to Salvation by the way of Crimes, Murthers, and Adulteries; that we render the effects of Predeſtination infallible, like the *Mahumetans*; ſo that a Man Predeſtinate living like a Devil, cannot fail to become happy like an Angel. That we would have an Adulterer, a Fornicator, yea a Man guilty of the Vileſt diſorders, may be as aſſured of his Salvation as Jeſus Chriſt; that our Lord Jeſus Chriſt deſpaired that he was damned; that we are Enemies to the Saints. In fine, Who could number all the Calumnies wherewith they load us, to render us odious? That is but a ſmall part thereof. And the moſt terrible of all, it's that though we juſtifie our ſelves never ſo often, and tell them we abhor all thoſe Hereſies, that we deteſt them, that we combat them; though we explain our ſelves never ſo much, and declare that the Words ſo abuſed are taken in a Counter-ſenſe; though we cry out againſt the Calumny, proteſt our Innocency, formally reject all the Conſequences imputed to us; that comes to nothing, and they ſtill return to the like again. We muſt needs be *Heretichs* at any rate, and they repeat againſt Us this day all thoſe Calamities, with the ſame air of Confidence as if we had nothing to anſwer thereto, or had never anſwered the ſame. We ſhould more eaſily bear with thoſe Exceſſes, if that we had none to complain of, but thoſe ſmall Declaimers, who do harangue on Shop-boards, and who preach in the Markets, from the Steps of a Croſs. If thoſe Outrages were done Us, but by thoſe little Scribes, who are void of Science, Name, Spirit, Honour and Conſcience, whereof the World is full. But

it's

it's impoſſible not to loſe our Patience, when we ſee Authors that are grave and able, learn'd and famous, compoſe great Volumes, whereof all the Pages are ſoiled with thoſe black Slanders, whereto we have anſwered an hundred times. When we cannot blame Ignorance and Inſufficiency, we cannot but complain of unſincere dealings, and ſay, that ſuch a Courſe is not honeſt. It's an inſeparable Character of the falſe Church; *Hereticks* have always dealt thus with the *Orthodox*. They have ſtill calumniated them, and have disfigured by their Imputations the pureſt and holieſt Doctrines; we need but to have read a few of the Holy Fathers to be aſſured thereof. But the true Church was always moſt tender of Sincerity; She would never ſlander her Adverſaries, and would never disjoyn Zeal from fair dealing.

Here is another kind of foul dealing, that appears leſs Criminal; it's that which flatters Religion, whereof ſhe draws the Picture; which diſſembles her deformities and gives an air of Innocence and Purity to all. This Artifice ſeems to be innocent, every one ſhould be permitted to make himſelf known by his beſt ſorts, and ſhew its faireſt ſide. And this is a Method, that hath been extreamly uſed for ſome years of late for to defend the Roman Church. There are two ways of defending her; one is, in rejecting the Manage of Policy, in uſing the moſt ordinary and common Expreſſions: In ſaying, for Example, That part of Religious Worſhip is due to Saints, that they may be invok'd as Interceſſours with God, as they to whom God hath given under himſelf the Government of the World; that Temples may be built, Faſts appointed, celebrate the Sacrifice of the Maſs to their Honour, make Vows to them, and

Vid. Bellarmine *de Sanctorum beat.* l. 1. cap. 18. *Enchirid.* c. 12. prop. 4.

and yield to them part of all that which may be called Religion; So ſpeaks *Vaſquez*; that the Senſe of the Catholick Church, confirm'd by Tradition and perpetual Uſe, is, that there is due to Saints a Sacred Adoration. In ſaying, that one may ask of them whatever is ask'd of God, *Health, Protection, Remiſſion of Sins, Salvation, Grace* and *Glory*: So that we pray not to them, as to the firſt Authors of theſe Graces. In ſaying, that one muſt reverence, adore and ſalute the Images of the moſt holy Virgin Mother of God, of the glorious Angels, and of all the Saints; and that all thoſe that are not of that mind ought to be Anathematized. In ſaying, That the Sacrifice of the Maſs is a true Sacrifice, and ſo called properly; that it's not a ſimple Commemoration of the Sacrifice of the Croſs, but a Propitiatory Sacrifice, which is offered for the Pains, for the Satisfactions, and for other Neceſſities of the Faithful. In thundering out which *Anathema's* againſt all that would not receive thoſe Propoſitions and all others in the very Senſe of the Church.

Vaſquez *in* 3. *part.* Thom. *Tom.* 1. *diſp.* 97.

Concilium Nicen. 2. *Can.* 2. *in Epiſt. ad* Conſt. *&* Iren.

Concil. Trident. *Seſſ.* 22. *Can.* 1. *&* 3.

There is a ſecond Manner of defending the Opinions and Practiſes of the Roman Church, that is, in ſweetning them: In ſaying, for Example, That the Worſhip of Saints is Nothing, at the bottom; that *Invocations* addreſſed to them are not of another Natnre, but ſuch as are made to living Saints, when we recommend our ſelves to their Prayers: That the Scandal taken from the Worſhip of Images is a Scandal ill taken; that at the bottom, they are ſet in the Church but for the uſe of Commemoration; that human *Satisfactions* are no prejudice to thoſe of Jeſus Chriſt;

Chriſt; becauſe they ſerve only to apply the Satisfaction of Jeſus Chriſt. The firſt Method was in this regard in the way of very fair dealing; but at this day things are very much altered; the firſt Method hath not been found ſignificant, therefore the ſecond is now taken up; yet have they not univerſally renounced the former. *Italy*, *Spain*, and moſt part of *Germany*, and even of *France*, either know not or reliſh not theſe Sweetnings.

Thoſe that are grown old in the old Opinions, do alſo reſpect the ancient Expreſſions as Conſecrated, and find it not difficult to uſe the Politicians as Prevaricators. I wiſh they would obſerve theſe conſiderable Words of Father *Mainbourg* in his Hiſtory of *Lutheraniſm*: *Theſe pretended Expoſitions of the Faith which ſuppreſs or diſſemble, or expreſs in ambiguous Terms only, or too much ſweetned*, a part of the Doctrine of the Church, *do ſatisfie neither the one nor the other, which do equally complain, that Men do mince it in an affair ſo delicate as Faith is, where Men cannot fail in one point, but that they muſt fail in all.* We underſtand well what he would ſay, and whom he aims at; it's neither at Cardinal *Contaren*, nor at the Authors of ancient *Enoticks*; it's to thoſe that do Byaſs it at this day in their Expoſitions of the Catholick Faith. Father *Mainbourg* writes like an honeſt Man; he is moſt able, and hath the right Senſe of things. There are then able and honeſt Men in the Roman Church, who diſapprove theſe ways of Sweetning, and dare to ſay and to print it: But there are others that think to proſper better in the Converſion of thoſe whom they call *Hereticks*, in ſtripping the Roman Church of all thoſe terrible Images wherewith others have cloathed it. Happily they may be of the ſame Apprehenſion with the others, but they judge it good to expreſs themſelves otherwiſe, to bring

nearer

nearer again thoſe Spirits, which they had ſcared by their hard Manners. Yet would I believe, that among thoſe moderate Perſons, there are many that do deal fairly, that would willingly have things as they expreſs them; who, if they were believed, would reduce the Worſhip of Images to a little matter, and would accommodate themſelves in divers reſpects to the Weakneſs of thoſe, whom they conſider as ſeparate from the Church. I believe the Author of the Saving Adviſes of the Virgin *Mary* to her indiſcreet Devotes, is of this Order; and I doubt not but he hath many Approbators. But though he had infinitely more, that alters nothing at the bottom. The Roman Church remains ſtill the ſame in her Worſhip, in her Canons, and in her Dogma's.

Among all thoſe Works, which have for their aim the Sweetning of things, and to lead Chriſtians into a Spirit of Reconciliation, there's none more famous than the little Book of my Lord of *Condom*, that hath for Title, *Expoſition of the Catholick Doctrine about Matters of Controverſie.* There was never any Work, whereof the Author and his Party have made more boaſt, eſpecially ſince it's fortified with the Approbations of *Rome.* They look thereon, as on the triumph of the *Roman* Church, and they pretend that thoſe changes of Religion, that are at this day ſufficiently ordinary, and which they call *Numerous Converſions*, are the effects of my Lord of *Condom's* Method. I grant that I am not able enough to enter into the Merit of that piece; I ſee nothing therein but what was written long ago. My Lord of *Condom* hath not been the firſt, who hath eſſay'd to diſguiſe the Doctrine of the Roman Church. It's more than fity years ſince that this Method of *Sweetning* hath been uſed to draw Men; and though it had not been printed, it's certain that it hath been uſed an hundred

hundred times by word of Mouth, and face to face. Except the delicate Dreſs, the ſweet and inſinuating Manners of my Lord of *Condom*, and ſome bold Propoſitions in the Subject of *Images*; I ſee nothing there of his own, nor that ſhould have gained him ſo many Approbations. Notwithſtanding mens Spirits are ſo affected, till labour be taken to recover them from it. The Roman Catholick conſiders this Book as the Buckler of his Faith, and the mighty Inſtrunient of Converſions; and the Proteſtant looks thereon, as on a Ghoſt, whereof he dreads the Illuſions. I am deceived if it be ſo dreadful as men imagine. All its Strength conſiſts in diſguiſing things from us, and making us to behold them in another face. Therefore there is need only to make that appear in its Natural ſtate, which he doth repreſent through a Veil to us.

That Work hath been Anſwer'd moſt learnedly and ſolidly, and if I had no other deſign but that of Anſwering it, I believe I ſhould not trouble my Pen about it; but here I much leſs purpoſe to Anſwer my Lord of *Condom*, than to make a Book oppoſite to his. All that Art and dexterity can imagine to engage thoſe of our Religion to embrace his own, is ſprinkl'd through his Book; and I will put into mine what I believe moſt capable to preſerve them from the peril whereinto he would caſt them. My Lord of *Condom* preſents his Religion to us under a Veil, which he hath compoſed by an extraordinary effort of Spirit. He would have Us to behold her only through that Veil. But he may take it well, though we have not that complaiſance for him, becauſe it might be fatal to our Salvation. I will therefore draw this Veil, paint out the Roman Religion according to Truth, whereto nothing can be reproached, and ſhew it in its Natural complexion. This is, in my mind, the beſt

Preſervative

Preſervative that we can give our People; and particularly it's of abſolute neceſſity to ruinate the Deſign of my Lord of *Condom*. Without having preciſely a deſign to combat him, yet will I fight him every where; becauſe I ſhall meet him every where, and will be obliged to take off the Veil which he hath ſpread upon the Worſhip and the *Dogma's* of his Church; I will bind my ſelf alſo to follow his Order, becauſe he hath nothing but what is natural enough.

One may eaſily judge, that the Affairs whereinto I chuſe to enter, is a queſtion of Fact purely; I will not engage my ſelf to the diſcuſſion of the Right. I do not enquire here, which hath beſt Reaſon, whether the Roman Church, or the Proteſtant; it's enough to know what is taught both in the one and in the other Religion, and not at all whether it be ill for either of them to teach ſo. Therefore will I forbear proving, and will not ſo much as touch thoſe Proofs that my Lord of *Condom* brings in for his own Party. But before we enter into the particulars, I believe it fit we ſhould make ſome general Reflexions.

ARTI-

ARTICLE I.

General Reflexions upon my Lord of Condom's *Book.*

FIrſt, To know a Book well, we muſt enter, if poſſible, into the Spirit of it, and ſee within what proſpect it hath been compoſed. The Work, now in hand, is one of thoſe that hath been produc'd by the deſign of reuniting the two Religions in *France*, a deſign which ſome great Ones had buſied their Head about. All the World knows the ſeveral Advances that have been made thereto by ſome particular Perſons. They of the Proteſtant Party, which have entred into this Propoſition, had concluded that it might be done, either by way of Accommodation, in obliging each of the Parties to yield ſome things; or by way of mutual Toleration; that is to ſay, That without leaving their places, they might conſider one another with Charity, and ſhould not damn one another with full authority, as is done. Theſe two Methods did not at all pleaſe the Roman Church; that is not it which She demanded. She could not take the firſt way, which is that of Accommodation, and of mutual Relaxation; for according to her Principles, being *Infallible*, ſhe could not relax any thing, but ſhe muſt relax ſome Truths, which thing Honour and Religion permitted not. The ſecond Party did pleaſe her much leſs; by that Way all things had remained in the ſtate wherein they are, both the Religions would haye joyned hands, but would not have been confounded nor reunited: The Proteſtant would have conſidered the Roman Catholick as his Brother, ſerving one God in a manner

manner ſomewhat different; but yet would have continued Proteſtant. I cannot blame thoſe Gentlemen for deſpiſing that Propoſition that cannot accord with Piety.

But I find it a ſurprizing thing that rejecting theſe two Ways of Reunion, they have propoſed us another, which is much more ſtrange. *For to reunite*, ſay they, *we muſt neceſſarily return to make up One and the ſame Body, to have the ſame Aſſemblies, participate of the ſame Sacraments, and live under the ſame Paſtours. But towards that, it's not neceſſary to change any thing in the Religion and Worſhip of the Catholicks; We muſt only make the Proteſtants comprehend, that they were to blame to regard the* Dogma's *and the Worſhip of the Church, in that ſort, wherewith they have regarded it hitherto. We muſt perſwade them that thoſe great Spaces, that divide the Catholick from the Proteſtant, are the only effects of miſtaken Imagination, that at the Bottom we are all near one another; that there are only ſome Miſtakes; that we teach not what they believe us to teach; that our Worſhip, which ſeems ſo oppoſite in the Service of one only God, is nothing of what it appears to be; that thoſe Appearances, though they ſeem to be ſo croſs one to another, are nevertheleſs at the bottom the moſt innocent in the World. And that being done, thoſe Gentlemen muſt reunite in returning to the Church; there is nothing more facile.* This is a ſtrange manner of Reuniting. When two oppoſite Parties are reunited, Compoſition is made, each one yields of its Rights. Here they would have Us to give all, and they would grant us nothing. Not that We had been capable of ſuffering our ſelves to be tempted by Propoſitions of Accommodation, and of mutual Relaxation. The Roman Church, on her Principles, will never make ſuch Propoſitions with ſincere purpoſe. And though ſhe ſhould

make

make them in earneſt, ſhe would find them impoſſible in their Execution. The *Gallican* Church hath no right to treat for the *Roman* Church, nor to relax for her, while ſhe remains tied to the Chief of that *Roman* Church. That which We would ask in that Treaty, is that which will never be granted Us; for we muſt not diſſemble, we would not have a Demy-Reformation; we would have them renounce that, which they conſider as Eſſential and Capital.

It's true, that the manner of Reunion, which thoſe Gentlemen have imagined, is of all the moſt commodious thing for their Church; but we look on it, as the worſt of all Evil, for Ours. After all the Advertiſements of my Lord of *Condom*, I would fain know what is more ſafe now for Us in the Roman Church, than what was when we firſt did come away from her? Do not all things perſevere therein in the ſame State? Do we ſee there the Temples filled with Images, and Men proſtrating themſelves before them; their Vaults reſounding with the Invocation of Creatures, Adorations rendred to that which we know not to be God? Is it then enough to ſay to us, That we did not underſtand our ſelves? You have thought we ſhould ſay that, and we would ſay quite another thing: Underſtand us well, and come in again, and you ſhall ſee that at the Bottom we are not far diſtanc'd one from the other. Surely, we muſt be very weak and very baſe to fall into that Snare, to renounce that Grace, which hath coſt us ſo much Blood; to forſake the Faith of our Anceſtors, which they have eſtabliſhed with ſo much labour, ſo much ſweat and watching, and whereto we have hitherto ſacrificed our Repoſe, our Fortune, and all our Worldly Intereſts. Either we had no reaſon to come out forth from the Roman Church, or there is no reaſon to invite us to return thither, without having brought in any change into the ſame.

To

To change Expreſſions and the manner of ſpeaking of Things, is to change nothing at the Bottom. Let them call the Service of Images, Invocation of Saints, the Worſhip of Reliques, with what Name they will, its ſtill the ſame thing. Let them put new Colours to the Adoration of the Euchariſt, it will ſtill be the Adoration of that which we do call a Simple Creature. So that we muſt needs come to the Bottom thereof to know whether we have reaſon.

I cannot forbear to add another Reflexion to that former. The *Sweetnings* of theſe Gentlemen do tend to make us ſee, that we deceive our ſelves when we were perſwaded, that we were far diſtanc'd one from another, and that our Debates are grounded upon our miſunderſtanding; that we agree in the Foundations, and that the reſt are but few ſmall things. It's upon this Suppoſition, that they exhort us to leave our Party to return to Theirs. But upon what Right do they make this Propoſition to us? I will ſuppoſe that what they inſinuate be true, that there be but a little Space between them and us; Might we not then ſay to them, *Well Sirs, Come to us, traverſe thoſe little Spaces; there is no farther diſtance from You to Us, than from Us to You. It cannot be more difficult for you to paſs this Way, than for us; Why muſt we our ſelves paſs all the Advances?*

Methinks I hear them cry out thereupon and ſay, *What Inſolence! Have we not the Poſſeſſion? We are the Church. You are gone out from the midſt of us. It's your part to return. You are the Innovators. You are but a handful of People, who have the boldneſs to oppoſe your ſelves to Millions of Men, and you would have thoſe Millions of Men to come to you? Is it not more juſt you ſhould go to them? There was no farther diſtance from the* Donatiſts *to the* Catholicks, *than from the* Catholicks *to the* Donatiſts: *But ſuppoſe*

poſe that the Heat which animated both Parties had been quenched, that they cleared themſelves, that they had acknowledged, that the queſtion was only but about matter of Fact, or their Controverſies but of little Importance. The Donatiſts, *upon that diſcovery, had but unhandſomly ſaid to the* Catholicks, *Return to us, that will be as commodious as if we our ſelves ſhould come to you.*

I am very ſenſible that this will be their Thought. Theſe Gentlemen ſay, that they are in Poſſeſſion. It's true, among other things, they are in Poſſeſſion to ſuppoſe as certain that which is in diſpute. They are the Church. It's that whereof we agree not. If they were the Church, and that Church ſound and entire, we would not be ſo unreaſonable, to propoſe it them for to come to us. The Church of St. *Auguſtine* was the true Church; that of the *Donatiſts* was in Schiſm. If they had perſwaded us, that which they aſſay to prove theſe many years, that we are *Schiſmaticks* and *Hereticks*, they would then have reaſon to invite us to make all theſe Advances, and we ſhould be in the wrong to expect them without moving our ſelves. We are not Innovators, we are Reſtorers of the Apoſtles Religion. We have the advantage of Antiquity of Doctrines and Worſhip; in compariſon whereof, Antiquity of Churches, of Edifices, of Chairs and Epiſcopal Seats, is nothing at all. We are in a perfect Conformity with the Scripture, and the Church Apoſtolick; that is better, than Conformity with the Church of the Tenth Age, and the following. The Queſtion then here is only of Fact thus, for if we hold the Apoſtles Doctrine, its certainly their part who have forſaken it, to return to us. Time cannot preſcribe againſt Truth. It's in vain to ſay, They have for Title a long Poſſeſſion. The more ancient that ſuch Wandrings are, the worſe they are. But that

cannot

cannot take from us the right of ſolliciting thoſe People to return. Beſides, it would be more eaſie for thoſe Gentlemen to return to us, than for us to joyn to them; for we ſhould not oblige them to any thing that would be againſt their Conſcience, ſeeing we adore only what they adore. But we cannot go to them, whilſt they do ſerve that which we cannot ſerve. If this Worſhip of Images, this Invocation of Saints, this Adoration of the Euchariſt, are ſo little a thing; and if that ſhould not hinder us from Joyning to them, why do they not abandon that little Thing, which ſcandalizes us ſo greatly, and which we reckon to be much? Is nothing to be done for Charity? Should not Men renounce their own Intereſt, when its but inconſiderable, for our Neighbours Salvation? I pretend not that theſe Reaſons will perſwade thoſe Gentlemen to abandon their Party and enter into ours; Nor that they are capable of doing it. So great a Buſineſs is not diſpatch'd in ſo little time: But it may give us to underſtand, that we have as much right as they to ask for a Reunion, without obligation to change any thing; and that all thoſe By-ways, which have been invented within this little time; ſome while Ways of Preſcription, then Ways of Prejudices or Prejudgments; then Ways of Sweetning are all Ways of Illuſion, which only hinder us from Treating of the Buſineſs to the bottom, and from entring into the particulars of the Controverſies. Becauſe thoſe Gentlemen do not find it commodious to keep that right Method, which hath been uſed hitherto, they are ſearching indireſt Ways.

I do not hope, that thoſe Sweetnings of my Lord of *Condom*, and of his Followers, will do any great thing for the general Peace of Chriſtianiſm, and for the Repoſe of particular Perſons. Yet I cannot but Eſſay, to get ſome little Advantage from it by the by

Aſſuredly,

Assuredly, we should be thankful to my Lord of *Condom* for his Book. Though it should not produce that effect which he hopes for from it, to wit, the Reunion of both Religions into one One; at least, naturally it should produce some Peace between both Parties. Till now, the Roman Catholick and the Protestant have almost considered one another, as the two *Antipodes* of the World Christian. At this day they labour to make them return from thence. To make our Spirits reapproach, they give us Explications tending to make us see, that we are not at such a distance as Men were perswaded of. These Explications of my Lord of *Condom*, that do reapproach in some parts his Doctrine to ours, do also without doubt cause to reapproach our Doctrine to his. If Disputes can be annihilated by the Explications of some Terms; If our Doctrine be not far distant from that of the Roman Church, and do not hurt the Foundation as is insinuated; Why then is it made a Phantasm to the People, Why then are Men arm'd against us? Why so much abhorring for those Men, that do not Sin, but in that they understand not the Doctrine of the Church? Why are the Powers arm'd, and the Arm of Flesh? Why have heretofore Floods of our Blood been drawn out? Why do they cast on us frightful Names of *Heretick*s, and *Excommunicate*, *damned Synagogues of Satan*, and *Organs of the Devil*? Methinks, if Men do but deal in good earnest, after those Sweetnings men should have a little Sweetness for us; or if they continue that rigorous and severe Method against us, it seems to be a proof, that these Sweetnings were not made with a Spirit of Sincerity, but only with a design to procure an Illusion to the Ignorant, and to furnish Pretences for those that do seek their Conveniences in the World.

This is a little advantage, which might accrue to us from my Lord of *Condoms* Book, if those of his Party would but be of his mind: but I will draw another much more considerable. It's, that at the bottom there was never a Book more favourable to the Protestants. If we do but consider well the Shape, which my Lord of *Condom* gives to all the controverted Articles, this is not a defence of the *Dogma's* of the Roman Church, it's not an Apology, it's properly an Excuse; it's a Palliative Book, if I may so speak. Now every man that excuses a Fact, a Doctrine, or an accused Person, by that it self confesses there is some Evil; he only tries to make good, that the Evil is tolerable. This is that whereto my Lord of *Condom* doth visibly lead us. With all his delicate Manners, and his Spiritual modelling, every Person unintereſt'd will conclude, that he hath felt some Evil to be within that Church, whereto he would have us Reunite; and that his Design is only to insinuate, That this Evil is tolerable, and that it ought not to hinder our Reunion. Methinks this appears therein easily, by a little attention given thereto; for Example, if we believe my Lord of *Condom*, An Image hath no other virtue, but that of recalling the Memory of the Original; there is properly no kind of Homage rendred to it, only Men do serve the Original in the presence of the Image. Is not that neatly enough to confess, That they that go beyond it are most guilty; that there is no reason to say, That Men must adore Images; that there is no reason to fasten any virtue thereto; to imagine, that an Image of our Lady doth more Miracles than another; that its blame worthy to carry them about in pomp, to prostrate ones self before them, to place them on Altars, to make Vows and Pilgrimages to them, and to burn Incense to them, as formerly they did to the false Gods? If Invocation of

Saints

Saints be done in the ſame Spirit, as the Prayers which we preſent to the Faithful alive to pray for us : It's to accuſe all thoſe who do Invocate the Saints in another Spirit.

After all that, I demand of thoſe Gentlemen, Why they do ſeek for an Extraordinary Turn ? That which they had uſed hitherto, either was good, reaſonable, and proper to give juſt Idea's of the Doctrine of the Roman Church ; or it was not ſo. If it was not, reaſon it is they ſhould take another. But how can it be, that for ſo many years they have defended the Roman Church, by ſo many Works, without finding the proper Turn, to give a juſt Idea of her Doctrine ? It's a blindneſs of the preceding Doctors hardly to be conceived. It's a good hap for my Lord of *Condom* to have firſt found out the true ſenſe of the Doctrine of the Church, whereof one cannot ſuſpect the cauſe. But if the Turn, which my Lord of *Condom* hath found out, is different ; in that thing it ſelf that it's different from others, doth it not condemn them ? If that which he ſaith to us be the only true Senſe of the Church, all other Senſes which Doctors have given it are falſe Senſes, and conſequently he condemns all thoſe that have not ſpoken like him. Without doubt, my Lord of *Condom* will ſay, *It was not his deſign to ſay any thing new ; that his Explications of the Doctrine of the Church are the Senſe of the Canons, of the Councils, and of the deciſions of the Doctors.* But if he pretended not to ſay any thing Extraordinary, whence then comes the great Noiſe which thoſe Gentlemen have made of that Work ? Can they look for ſo great Honour from a Thing, that ſhould have been ſaid by all other Authors ? Whence is it, that they

The Jeſuites Doctrine of Probability will ſalve that.

have begg'd Approbations from all parts of the World? That they put amongſt thoſe Approbators, *Cardinals, Biſhops*, yea the *Pope* himſelf? For a thing which all the World had ſaid, ſhould there be need of ſo mony Props, ſeeing it could not be combated nor queſtion'd? Why doth my Lord of *Condom*, at the end of his Work, ſhew, that he would not have us examine the different Means, which the Catholick Theologues have uſed to eſtabliſh, or to clear up the Doctrine of the Council of *Trent*? If he be agreed with the Doctors of his ſide, hath he cauſe to fear leſt we ſhould compare his Senſes with theirs? And is it not clear, that he confeſſes thereby, that he ſtands in great oppoſition to them? If my Lord of *Condom* hath brought to light but the true and ancient Senſe of the Church, why doth he ſay at the end of his Book, that he hath ruined all Diſputes? for that is it which theſe words ſignifie, [*For to ſay in this Treatiſe ſomething ſolid, &c. they muſt ſhew that this Explication leaves all Diſputes in their intire ſtate.*] He pretends then, that his Explication muſt make all Diſputes to ceaſe. I do not believe, that he pretends thereto by the force of the Reaſons, whereby he hath upheld his cauſe. For a little Book that only explains, and which doth not prove, cannot cauſe Diſputes to ceaſe by way of Diſcuſſion. If it were true, that the Senſe which my Lord of *Condom* doth give, is the Senſe of the Roman Catholick Church, that it ſhould be received by both Parties, and that it would not leave Diſputes in their whole ſtate; it were true alſo, that it would be ſome thing which the graveſt Authors had not yet perceived. For hitherto, all the Divines of the Roman Catholick Church have verily believed, that the Controverſies about Images, Invocation of Saints, Indulgences, Satisfactions, were intire Diſputes and moſt real. The Council of *Trent* hath without

doubt

doubt believed ſo; for if their Senſe had been that which my Lord of *Condom* gives, and that it's a Senſe which leaves not Diſputes whole, why hath it pronounc'd *Anathema's* againſt the *Lutherans* and *Zuinglians*, about things, whereof it's deciſions made all Diſputes to vaniſh? Let's deal truly; Did not the Council fulminate and condemn thoſe People? They did not then believe, that the Senſe of their Canons could eaſily be reconciled with the Doctrine of *Zuinglius* and of *Luther*. Beſides that, I do not well conceive how my Lord of *Condom* can defend himſelf, for having brought to light a Senſe that was unknown to all that have Written, and to the Prelates of the Council of *Trent* themſelves. Without doubt thoſe Prelates pronounced Oracles without underſtanding them, and more than an Age after an Interpreter is come, who hath diſcovered that which the Holy Spirit had hitherto kept ſecret. But it imports not, whether my Lord of *Condom* be the firſt or only Man that hath underſtood the Council of *Trent*, to the Excluſion of the Council it ſelf, he cannot hinder us from concluding, That in eſtabliſhing his Senſe as the only good, and as the Doctrine of his Church, he condemns all others which the Doctors have given hitherto; and therefore he acts for us, and favours our Cauſe, as much as it can be favoured.

Although the Explications of my Lord of *Condom* ſhould terminate ſome different, we ſhould not be obliged to believe upon his Word, that his Senſe ſhould be that of the Council of *Trent*. It hath reproached to theſe Gentlemen, that theſe Explications were againſt the Bull of *Pius* the Fourth, which expreſly forbids all Explications of that Council. Theſe be its own words; [*To avoid the Confuſions and Diſorders that might ariſe, if it were permitted to every One to bring to light their Commentaries and Interpretations*

upon the Decrees of the Council; by Authority Apoſtolical we forbid all Perſons Eccleſiaſtick or Laick, of whatſoever Dignity, Condition, Honour or Power whatſoever; and all Prelates, under pain of being Interdicted the Entrance of the Church, and others under pain of Excommunication, to undertake, without our Authority, Commentaries, Gloſſes, Annotations, Obſervations, or any other kind of Interpretations under whatſoever Name; neither under the very pretence of maintaining the Decrees better, or Executing, or any other Colour. And if any find there is any thing obſcure, leſs clear, needing Interpretation, we ☞ *Ordain he ſhould aſcend to the place which the Lord hath choſen, that is to the Apoſtolick Seat, which is the Maſter of all the Faithful, and whereof the Holy Council it ſelf hath acknowledged the Authority in a manner ſo full of reſpect.*] After that, ſhould it be permitted to any private Man to give to the Council a Senſe unknown to the whole Earth, unknown even to the Fathers, who made up the Council? To that thoſe Gentlemen ſay,

Advertiſement, p. 99. *Its one thing to interpret what is obſcure and doubtful, another thing to propound what is clear, and uſe it to deſtroy falſe Impreſſions.* It ſeems to me, that thoſe Words ſignifie that it is not true, that Gloſſes have been made on the Council of *Trent*; they have only related its Terms ſo clear, that they are capable of deſtroying all the falſe Idea's that Men had of its Doctrine. Can that be ſaid in Conſcience, that they have related only the very Words of the Council? It's ſaid, about the Invocation of Saints; That

Advertiſm. pag. 50. *Explic.* p. 24. *we pray to them in that ſame Spirit that we pray to our Brethren, which are on the Earth, to pray for us and with us to our Common Maſter, in the Name of*

of our Common Mediator, who is Jeſus Chriſt.

Are thoſe the Words of the Council? Doth it ſay, They ſhould not be invok'd, but in that manner and in the ſame Spirit, that we pray the Saints that are on Earth to pray for us? I would make Judges thereof, ſuch as have Eyes and can but read; for theſe be the Words of the Council, according to my Lord of *Condom*'s Verſion; [*Becauſe that the Saints, who reign with Jeſus Chriſt, do offer to God their Prayers for Men, it's good and uſeful to invoke them, in a Suppliant manner, and to have recourſe to their Aid and to their Succour, to impetrate of God his Bleſſing, by his Son Jeſus Chriſt our Lord, who alone is our Saviour and our Redeemer.*] About *Satisfactions*, my Lord of *Condom* ſaith, *That which is called* Satisfaction, *is after all but the Application of the Satisfaction of Jeſus Chriſt.* And the Council of *Trent* ſaith, *That in ſuffering and ſatisfying for our ſins, we are made conformable to our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, who alſo hath ſatisfied for our Sins.*] Upon the Subject of *Images*, the *Advertiſement* ſaith, *That we ſerve not Images, but ſerve our ſelves of Images to raiſe up our ſelves to the Originals.* And the Council ſaith, *That Men muſt render to Images the Reſpect and Veneration which is due to them; that they muſt be kiſſed, mens Heads be uncovered, and proſtrate themſelves before them.*]

Seſſ. 25. de Invocatione Sanctorum.

Advert ſement, p. 37.

Seſſ. 22. Can. 3.

Theſe three Examples may ſuffice to ſhew, that thoſe Gentlemen do not deal fairly when they ſay, *That they go not againſt the Intention of* Pius *the Fourth his Bull, and that they make no Gloſs upon the Council of* Trent.

But I am not minded, that we ſhould draw a Proceſs againſt them about it. Let them avoid the Ordinance of *Pius* the Fourth, I conſent: Let them interpret the Council againſt the Intention of the Bull. I do not think we have any right to oppoſe it. Thoſe Gentlemen do make Rules, and have ſuch regard to them as they think good. That is not our buſineſs. And after all, that Prohibition of *Pius* the Fourth hath taken but little place. A thouſand Controverſies have been raiſed or continued ſince that Council, and every one of the Parties hath explained it to his own favour. But what we ſay, and have right to ſay, is, That we are not obliged to receive the Interpretations of the Council of *Trent*, oppoſite to thoſe that have been given us by all the Doctors of the School, which we daily read in the univerſal Practice and conſtant Uſe of the Roman Church. The Author of the *Advertiſement* may well ſay, *That we will not believe neither the Council, nor its Catechiſm, nor their Confeſſion of Faith, nor the Biſhops, nor the Pope himſelf. We believe our Eyes, we believe what we read and what we ſee. Though at this day all the Roman Church ſhould tell us, as this Author doth, We do not ſerve Images, God forbid; but we ſerve our ſelves of Images to raiſe us up to the Originals. We would not believe it, and would not be obliged to believe it, ſeeing we ſee every day the contrary.*

Pag. 56.

Advertiſement p. 62.

What Obſtinacy! ſay they; *the Biſhops, Cardinals, and the Pope himſelf approve all theſe Explications of my Lord of* Condom, *and that of the Author of the* Advertiſement; *and you'l believe that Perſons of ſo great a Character, are either Cheats, that diſſemble their Sentiments or Ignaro's, that know not their Religion.* I wiſh they would not preſs us about that.

We

We do not believe those Gentlemen to be ignorant, they know their Religion well enough; but prudently men may often say of what they know, that only which they think capable of leading them to the End that they aim at. They would diminish the Aversion we have for the Worship and the Doctrines of the Roman Church. Prudence therefore would have them to keep from our sight that which offends us, and that a Curtain be drawn thereon.

Let's do those Gentlemen as much Honour as they can ask, to my understanding. Let's believe that they deal fairly, that is, that sincerely they would have things to be as they express them. Really, we no ways doubt, but there are at this day in the Roman Church many Persons, who disapprove the Excesses which are practised in that Church, about devotion to the Creatures. They willingly wish, That Images were not served with Religious Worship, they would bring a great allay to the Invocation of Saints, if they might be believ'd, yea, happily they might go further. I grant, that my Lord of *Condom*, and the Archbishops and Bishops, his Approvers, may have this Sentiment; and that we may put into the same rank the Cardinals *de Bona* and *Sigismund* of *Chigy*, the most Reverend P. *Hyacinth. Libelli*, Archbishop of *Avignion*, the most R. F. *Capi Sacchi*, Master of the Sacred Palace, my Lord *Michael Ange Ricci*, Secretary to the holy Congregation of *Indulgences*; the Father *Mr. Laurent Brancari de Laurea*; the Abbot *Gradi*; the Bishop and Princes of *Munster*, and the Pope himself *Innocent* the Eleventh, now sitting. What doth all that but confirm us in the Thoughts, that we have reason to condemn the Excesses that are now condemn'd by Persons, which had a great interest to justifie them? But can that oblige us not to believe our Eyes, not to believe what we see and what we read? Before they can

have any right to preſs us thereabout, things ſhould be put into that ſtate wherein they ſay that they are.

I hope, that entring into the particulars we ſhall clearly ſhew, that things are in that ſtate wherein we conceive them; and not in that wherein they would have us regard them. Mean while, I will ſay, that the Providence of God permits for our Juſtification, that in an Age wherein they would perſwade us that White is Black, there ariſe from time to time ſome Father *Creſſets*, that do revive all that *Alexus* of *Salo*, the *Bernardine de Buſtis*, and the *Salazars*, have ſaid moſt exceſſively and hainouſly upon this matter. Thoſe Works are printed in the Capital of the Kingdom with Approbation, with Priviledge, and with all the marks of Honour, that might poſſibly be given, in the very front thereof. Whilſt they ſell under cover, the Saving Advices of the Virgin to her indiſcreet *Devati*, and the Works done for the maintaining thereof. Add thereto, that they ſend Poſt through all *Europe* under the name of the *Journal of the Learned*, the Praiſe of thoſe Books which are tranſported with ſo much Violence againſt Moderate Perſons.

It's true, that the Book of my Lord of *Condom*, and the *Advertiſement*, which ſerves for a Preface, are alſo upheld by ſplendid Approbations. But to what purpoſe? That Book enters not into the Particulars, it Condemns nothing, it Juſtifies all, it Explains. It's true that he grants, that there are Practices of Devotion which he doth not approve too much: It's that which is ſignified by theſe Words, [*It nothing avails to object againſt us, neither thoſe Practiſes which they pretend to be general, nor the Senſe of particular Doctors; for without examining thoſe uſeleſs Facts, it ſuffices to ſay, in one word, that thoſe Practiſes and, Opinions*

Advertiſement. p. 101.

Opinions, ſuch as they be, which will not be conform'd to the Spirit and Decrees of the Council, are nothing to the Religion, nor to the Body of the Catholick Church.] They are loſt blows, which touch nothing, becauſe they aim at too many things. Thoſe Gentlemen, who diſapprove in general the Practiſes which are not conform to the Spirit of the Council of *Trent*, would find work enough, if they were obliged to open their mind and to ſpeak clearly. They would fear the ſame Lot, with the Saving Advices of the Virgin to her indiſcreet *Devoti*, *viz.* That *Rome*, which hath given its Approbation to that diſavowing of ſome indiſcreet Devotions, conceived in general terms, might nevertheleſs cenſure thoſe Cenſors, if they would enter into Particulars, and openly condemn what they approve not. It's known, in ſome meaſure, how Jealous the Roman Church is of thoſe Practiſes which are condemned by honeſt Men, and by moderate Spirits. One may judge thereof by the Welcom given to the *Bull*, which the Pope hath publiſhed to ſuppreſs an Office of the immaculate Conception of the Conception of the Virgin, and of many Indulgences. That is too publick not to have come to our knowledge. It's certain, that if there were a Tribunal Superiour to that of *Rome*, this Tentative had been there vigorouſly repulſed. The Roman Church, that could not cenſure it, hath at leaſt deſpiſed it. This Example may let us ſee, that it's not ſufficient that the Pope ſhould approve or diſapprove any thing, to make it to be or not to be. Though *Innocent* the Eleventh had approved the Explications of my Lord of *Condom*, it will not be neceſſarily true, that they ſhould be conform'd to the Senſe of the Roman Church. Thoſe Gentlemen grant, that Popes are often but particular Perſons, and that do not always act under the Character of publick Perſons. And we may ſay, with ſome kind of aſſurance, that what was

approved

approved by the Pope of this day; if Times change but a little, might come to be condemned by one of his Succeſſors. There want no Examples of the like Contrarieties in the Pieces that flow from this See.

ARTICLE II.

A General Idea of both Religions.

IT's time to enter into the Book of my Lord of *Condom*. At his entrance he doth diſcover his Intention. He hopes (ſaith he) that his *Expoſition* ſhall produce two good effects; [*Firſt, That many Diſputes ſhall vaniſh altogether, becauſe they are founded upon falſe Explications of our Creed. The Second, That the Diſputes which ſhall remain, ſhall not appear like the Principles of the pretended Reform'd, ſo Capital, as they at firſt would make them to be believed; and that according to thoſe very Principles they have nothing that hurts the foundations of the Faith.*] That is to ſay, To expreſs the things by other Words, that my Lord of *Condom* will cauſe both Religions ſo to reapproach to that Point, that one may paſs from the Proteſtant Religion to the Roman without endangering his Salvation in any way, although the Proteſtants do teach nothing but Verities. Becauſe that the Controverſies, that ſeparate the Proteſtant from the Catholick Roman, either are not real, or elſe regard not the foundations of the Faith. If that be not the ſenſe of his Words, I grant that I ſee none therein. I muſt ask my Lord of *Condom* pardon, but I cannot forbear to tell him, that I find not this

Expoſ. p. 4.

deſign

deſign to be honeſt; it is to lead Men to betray Truth and their Conſciences. The Principle, which he lays, is of good uſe for his Church in *France*, where Roman Religion is predominant, which hath on her ſide all Worldly advantages. But it's to be feared, that he will carry on his Catholick to renounce eaſily their Religion in *England*, *Holland*, *Denmark*, *Swedland*, and in other places, where Charges and Advantages are diſtributed by the Proteſtants: For one needs not be extreamly turn'd to the ſide of Libertiniſm, for to ſay, If Men can paſs without Risk from the Proteſtant Religion, though they believe it to be true, to the Catholick Religion, acknowledging therein ſome defects; one may alſo without danger paſs from the Catholick Religion to the Proteſtant Religion, in believing this moderately bad. We muſt tell the Truth, it's a dangerous Snare that is laid for Us.

The Author of the *Advertiſement* doth conjure Proteſtants by *Charity*, which is God himſelf; and by the Name of *Chriſtians*, which is common to us, to judge no more of the Catholick Doctrine by what is told them in their Sermons, but by this Expoſition. But I conjure them, by the Care they ought to have of their Salvation, to beware of the Illuſions that are prepared for them, and not to ſeek here for Pretences, when they ſhall be tempted to quit a Religion hated and diſfavoured, to follow that which opens the Way to all Preferments. There is no leſs Concerns in this affair than Eternal damnation. God, who will prove all falſe Doctrines by the Fire of his Word, and thoſe that ſhall have followed them by that of his terrible Judgment, cannot be deceived by Equivocations, nor by imperfect Expoſitions. I demand of them a little Sincerity, a little Love for their Salvation, and a moderate good Senſe; with thoſe, *Advertiſement*, p. 73.

one

one may eaſily judge, whether both Religions be ſo near to each other, that they differ not but by Diſputes, which may be cauſed to vaniſh in explaining ſome Terms; or by Opinions, that hurt not the foundations of Faith. I will firſt give a general Idea both of the One and of the other.

I'le ſuppoſe an Infidel, who ſeeks for Religion in the ſeveral Sects, which are among the Chriſtians. He enters into the Churches of the Roman Catholicks, he ſees them filled with Pictures, and thoſe Images themſelves magnificently adorn'd, put into the moſt Sacred places, having at their feet many Suppliants, Perſons proſtrate before them, kiſſing them, embracing their knees, burning Torches before them, or Wax Candles, incenſing them and carrying them about in pompous Proceſſions. In thoſe Churches alſo doth he ſee Altars, and thereon a Sacrifice of the Body and Blood of a God-man, who every day, after ſome Myſtical Ceremonies deſcends from Heaven, and comes to place himſelf really under the Accidents of the Conſecrated Bread and Wine. He ſees, I ſay, a Sacrifice of Human Fleſh, but inviſible, which is done with a great Shew and Attendance of Ceremonies, for the Propitiation of the Sins of the Dead, and for all the Neceſſities of the Living. He ſees an Object, which appears to be meer Bread, which he muſt be made to adore as his God, his Redeemer and Maſter. He ſees Men, that make their Prayers, and that ſing Sacred Hymns; but he meets with the Veil of a Language ſtrange and unknown, which is diffuſed through all this Worſhip, and doth conceal it quite from Vulgar Eyes. By the favour of an Interpreter he penetrates through this Veil, and under it he ſees Prayers and Invocations addreſſed to Creatures, whereto are given the magnificent Names of *Mediators*, *Mother of Mercifulneſs*, *Queen of Heaven*, *Refuge of Sinners*, *Gate*

Gate of Paradice, &c. from whom Men do requeſt to be delivered from Maladies, recovery of Health, to be cured of the Languors of their Souls, to be looſed from the Bonds of their Sins, to receive increaſe of Virtues, to be delivered from Hell, and to be put into the poſſeſſion of the Glory of Heaven, by their Merits and by their Interceſſion. He ſees a Religion abounding in Ceremonies; whereof the Miniſters are cloath'd with Habits extraordinary and myſtical: He ſees their *Croſſes, Holy Water*, and a great external Shew altogether pompous and compounded with an incredible Number of different Parts. Piercing yet further, he ſees Men ſet upon their Tribunals, at the feet whereof they ſhew him other Men, on their Knees, confeſſing their Sins to them, and expect Remiſſion from them; and he hears thoſe Spiritual Judges on thoſe Tribunals, who impoſe on Sinners, *Penitences, Faſtings, Pilgrimages, Hair-Cloth, Cilices, rough Shifts*, to ſatisfie thereby God and the Church, who preach to them, *That all the Sins committed before Baptiſm are expiated ſolely and entirely by the Blood of Jeſus Chriſt; but that every Man muſt ſatisfie for his Sins committed after Baptiſm.* That tell them *That Men muſt labour to merit Eternal life by good Works*: That teach them, *That the good Works, wherein God takes pleaſure, are among other, Devotions for the Saints, Pilgrimages, Vows, tedious Tautologies of certain Prayers, obſerved in the Honour of ſome of thoſe Saints, and of their Images.* Who give them to obſerve a long Liſt of Eccleſiaſtical Laws, about *Faſts, diſtinctions of Meats, Corporal Mortifications.* That declare to them, *That the Non-obſervance of thoſe Laws of the Church will damn them, as much as the violation of Gods Commands.* Which tell them alſo, *That after this life they cannot hope to enter immediately into Heaven, but that they muſt paſs through a place of Torment,*

where

where they ſhall be examined, happily for many Ages, by a cruel Fire, until they have intirely ſatisfied for thoſe Sins, for which they could not make Satisfaction during this life. He ſees Prieſts upon thoſe Tribunals, to give, with a Tone of *Authority* and of *Power*, the Remiſſion of Sins to thoſe Penitents, and to tell them, *I abſolve you.* They hear them ſay, *That Men muſt receive their Orders, and thoſe of the Church, as ſo many Sentences from Heaven. That this Church is infallible, and exempt from Errour; that She is Judge, without Appeal, of all Debates. That the Holy Scripture, in regard of us, holds her Authority but only from Her; that we could not know the Divinity of the Word of God, but only by the Teſtimony of the Church; that She is the Interpreter of her Senſe, and that the Interpretations which ſhe gives, though they ſeem contrary to Senſe, to Reaſon, and even to ſome places of this very Scripture, ought to be received with a Soveraign Submiſſion.* Above thoſe Men, which are only called Prieſts, he ſees ſeveral Dignities; but above all, he ſees a great Monarch Spiritual and Temporal, who calls himſelf *Jeſus Chriſts Lieutenant*, the *Viſible Head of the Church*, the *Mouth of God*, who pronounces Oracles, and who can never Erre; who is above Emperours and Kings; who can eſtabliſh them, and who can deſtroy them. Behold, what our Infidel may ſee in the Roman Church. Neither he, nor I do pronounce any thing, we ſay not whether it be good or bad.

Going out from thence, he enters into the Temples of the Proteſtants, wherein he ſees nothing of what he had ſeen in that place, whence he came forth. He ſees there no Images, no Altars, no Sacrifices, no Pomp, no Ceremony. They tell him, for a reaſon of this difference, *God is jealous of his Honour, he would not have any Service done to Images, he hath expreſly forbidden*

bidden it in the Second Command of his Law. The Sacrifices of Chriſtians are *Praiſes* and *Thankſgivings*, *Works of Mercy*, *Offerings* and *Alms*; theſe are the Oblation of the Heart and Affections, and their Perfumes are their *Prayers*. We have no Altars; for ſince that Jeſus Chriſt did Sacrifice his Sacred Perſon for our Salvation, having no more Sacrifices, we need no more Altars. Our Infidel lending his Ear to what is ſaid, hears indeed nothing but Prayers and Hymns, which are Sung; Sermons, Prayers addreſſed to God; no Angels, no Saints invoak'd: They tell him, *Prayer is the Principal of our Homages, and the firſt act of our Adoration, therefore we reſerve it for God. We believe that we ſhould offer a great Wrong to the Divinity, if we did divide his Honour between Him and his Creatures.* They ſhew to this Infidel a ſmall number of Sacraments, adminiſtred with great ſimplicity. Nothing is diſguiſed from him; They tell him, *What you ſee on this Table is true Bread and true Wine; but it's Bread and Wine myſtical: It is the Sacrament of Jeſus Chriſt crucified; it is the Symbol of his Fleſh and Blood, and the precious Pledge of the Love of God, the Seal of our Juſtification, and One of the Means of our Sanctification. But the Grace which is adjoyned doth not deſtroy Nature.* Inſtead of cauſing him to adore, what his Senſes tell him to be *Bread*; They tell him, *Take heed, leſt under any Pretence whatever, you render to the Creature that Honour which is due only to the Creator*; for he that ſaid, *Thou ſhalt worſhip the Lord thy God, and him alone ſhalt thou ſerve*, will not be paid with any Excuſes; it will not avail to ſay, *I ſuppoſed that my Saviour came under that appearance of Bread.* Our Infidel ſees a Religion which keeps nothing ſecret from him, under pretence of *Myſtery*. They do not tell him, about the Word of God, *Walk therein as in a dan-*

gerous

gerous Way; either read not at all, or read with a Spirit of Submiſſion, for all that the Church hath taught you: Do not believe what your Eyes will ſeem to tell you about your Lectures; and whatſoever you may meet withal, conclude nothing that may be oppoſite to the Faith of your Doctors. On the contrary, They lay before him the Scripture on the Tribunal of the Church; They tell him, *Obey your Leaders, ſuffer not your ſelves to be conducted by the falſe Lights of your own Reaſon. Submit to the Myſteries, but let not your Submiſſion be blind; conſult the Scripture, read, inſtruct your ſelves, and believe nothing upon the Witneſs of Men: Do not reſt but upon the Teſtimony of God; His Word is clear, ſolid, ſufficient for your Inſtruction; His Authority is Soveraign and Independent of any other.* He ſees not, in the Worſhip of that Religion, any ſtrange Language, which diffuſes Darkneſs through all; which conceals Myſteries from the Eyes of Ignorant Ones; all is naked, all is open, all is ſimple. He ſees, he hears all that is done, all that is ſaid; every one Prays in the Tongue he underſtands, and which is underſtood in the Country where he is. This Infidel ſees Preachers, which exhort him to Repentance, to Mortification, to renouncing the Vanities and the Idols of the World; but they do not impoſe on him the Neceſſity of declaring all the Motions of his Soul to a Man; they order him to confeſs primarily to God; then they adviſe him to make choice of a wiſe Director, to diſcover with Liberty to him the Wounds of his own Conſcience, and to ask his Advices. They tell him, *That all Human Satisfactions are incapable of paying the Juſtice of God; That our Lord Jeſus Chriſt hath paid for us abundantly; That his Merit is granted to us by a gratuitous Mercy*; and *that the true Satisfaction which God requires, is the Contrition of the Heart, Faith, Charity and Amend-*

ment

ment of Life. They do not charge him with the multitude of External Obſervations, of *Faſts*, of *Macerations*, of *Pilgrimages.* They ſay to the contrary, *That bodily Exerciſe is profitable to little; but that ſolid Piety hath the Promiſes of this preſent life, and of that which is to come.* They labour to draw him out of the Security that the Worldlings are plunged in; but they ſeek not to retain him in perpetual Terrours. They tell him, *There is no Salvation for the Sinner, that perſeveres in Impenitency; but that the true Penitent may be aſſured, that God will ſhew him Mercy.* They aſſure him, *That if his Sins be pardoned him in this life, they ſhall alſo be pardoned him in the other too,* and *that there is no Purgatory, nor Torments, through which Men are to paſs, to arrive to Paradiſe.* They confeſs to him, *That they have not the power to remit Sins*; They tell him, that *that appertains to God only*; but they tell him, *That God never refuſes that Grace, to thoſe that ask it with the Spirit of Humility.* In fine, He ſees nothing Pompous in the Government, or that may reliſh of the Spirit of the World; No Monarchs, no Spiritual Soveraigns. He ſees none but Conductors, that are Men of an equal Authority; or if he ſees, in ſome places, within that Church ſome Biſhops, and ſome Archbiſhops; He underſtands that thoſe Perſons make Profeſſion to have no other Head, for the Spirituals, but *Jeſus Chriſt*; and no other for their Temporals, than thoſe which God hath eſtabliſhed in the World, by his Providence. If this Infidel, who hath thus caſt his Sight upon theſe two Religions, be wiſe, he will ask time to think of his Choice, and will pronounce nothing upon what he hath ſeen. But in Conſcience, can any Man believe, that this Man, who hath no other light but that of good Senſe, can perſwade himſelf that theſe two Parties make up but one Religion; that it is the ſame

thing

thing, that their Differences are not Eſſential? In one, He ſees Altars and Sacrifices; in the other, he ſees none. In the one, he hears them invoke Saints and Angels; in the other, he ſees they content themſelves to reverence their Name, and to invoke God. In the one, he ſees Images to be ſerved; in the other, he ſees a mortal averſion for that Worſhip. In the one, he underſtands Nothing; in the other, he underſtands all. If this Man ſuffers himſelf to be conducted by his Natural Lights, he will without doubt believe, that theſe two Religions are abſolutely different; and I cannot imagine, that he could believe what my Lord of *Condom* ſaith, That the Diſputes of theſe two Parties can be nullified by explaining ſome Terms, and that what remains hath nothing Capital, and that can hurt the foundations of the Faith.

ARTI-

ARTICLE III.

That we agree not about Fundamental Points.

BUt happily may ſome ſay, That this general Review of the two Religions is proper only to make an Illuſion; becauſe, that in this Method, Men judge only by appearances. Now its true, that they are in an Appearance of great diſtance; whereas in examining things in particulars and at the bottom, it may be that they would go near to accord about thoſe things, and ſhould only diſpute about Terms. That might happily be, and therefore I will not forbear entring into a particular *Examen* of each Article.

Firſt, My Lord of *Condom* ſaith; *That we all agree about the Foundations of the Faith; that the Doctrines which we eſteem Fundamental, are all believed and profeſſed in the* Roman *Church.* He brings for Witneſs thereof Monſieur *Daillé*, who ſaith in his Book entituled, *Faith founded upon the Scriptures*, That *all Fundamental Articles are without Conteſt, that the* Roman *Church profeſſes to believe them; That in Truth we do not hold all the Opinions of that Church; but that we hold all their Beliefs, or Creances.* *Expoſ.* p. 5.

My Lord of *Condom* lays another Maxim, which he draws from our Principles: It's, *That if one agrees with the Foundations, and then lays down Opinions which does overthrow thoſe Foundations by Conſequences; we muſt not impute thoſe Conſequences to him who diſavows. The Opinion of the* Lutherans, *about the real Preſence of the Body of Jeſus Chriſt in the Euchariſt, deſtroys*

deſtroys the Human Nature of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt by a lawful Conſequence; but the Lutherans *diſavow that Conſequence, therefore we will not impute it to them.* He would have us to have the ſame Equity for his Church. For Example, She eſtabliſhes the Sacrifices of the Maſs, She lays down the Interceſſion of Saints, She ordains Penances and Satisfactions: We ſay, That the firſt of them deſtroys the Sacrifice of Jeſus Chriſt; that the ſecond prejudices his Mediation; that the others are injurious to the Super-abounding fulneſs of his Merits. But they ſay, they are only *Conſequences*, which the *Roman* Church diſowns; therefore we may not impute the ſame to them without Calumny.

I might have many things to ſay thereabout, If I had deſigned to make a great Book; but I will reſtrain my ſelf within this. That this Conſideration cannot be a Means of Reunion, nor a Reaſon of our Re-entrance into the *Roman* Church: Firſt, Becauſe it's not true, that both Parties agree about all the Proteſtants eſteem to be Fundamental. There are Three general Foundations in Religion: Firſt, That there is a God, who is to be adored. The Second, That there is but one God, and we ought to ſerve and adore none but him. The Third, That this God is to be ſerved in Jeſus Chriſt joyntly with him, and according to the Religion which he hath taught. The firſt is the foundation of all Religion in general: The ſecond, the Foundation of the true Religion, in that it embraces the Religion of *Moſes* and that of Chriſt: And the Third is the Foundation of the Chriſtian Religion. The *Roman* Church receives the firſt Foundation, That God is to be ſerved and adored. She receives the Third but in Words, for ſhe makes indeed Profeſſion to adore God, according to the Religion which Jeſus Chriſt hath taught; but we pretend that her

her Worſhip is not ſuitable to her Profeſſion. They muſt not anſwer me, that we are to blame to pretend that. Happily may we be to blame; but at preſent the Queſtion is not to know, whether we have reaſon; but only to know, if, in our Principles, the *Roman* Church deſtroys ſome Foundation of the Faith. Now ſhe deſtroys, according to us, this One; therefore its impoſſible that we can joyn with her. But ſhe deſtroys much more openly the Second of thoſe Foundations, in that ſhe ſerves and adores that which is not God, according to Proteſtants. We muſt adore a God: behold the firſt Foundation, and the *Roman* Church receives it. We muſt adore none, but God: behold the ſecond Foundation, which is no leſs important than the firſt; and that is it which the *Roman* Church abſolutely deſtroys. She adores the Sacraments of the Euchariſt; *Yea*, ſay they, *but it's in the Suppoſition, that the Euchariſt becomes the Humanity of Jeſus Chriſt, that is to ſay, the Humanity of God.* But that is nothing to the preſent Queſtion. It ſuffices me, that it's moſt evident, that according to our Principles, the *Roman* Church adores another, beſides God, and by Conſequence ſhe alſo deſtroys, according to us, one of the principal Foundations of the Faith.

My Lord of *Condom* will then permit me to tell him, That he hath not read in any of our Authors, that our Church agrees with his in the Foundations of the Faith. Monſieur *Daillé* hath not ſaid ſo; and if he had ſaid it, I would make no difficulty to ſay, That he was deceived. We only ſay, That we believe nothing but what the *Roman* Church believes with us; but that we believe not all that the *Roman* Church believes. We diſtinguiſh Affirmative Articles from the Negative. We agree with the *Roman* Church about Affirmative Articles, *viz.* we all believe that there is a God, that he is to be adored; that there is a

Jeſus

Jeſus Chriſt, that he is dead, riſen again, aſcended to Heaven, *God bleſſed for ever* with the Father; that he is the Redeemer of the World &c. But we agree not about the Negative Articles, and among them, there are ſome that reſpect the Foundations; ſuch is that whereof we ſpeak, *Thou ſhalt adore none but God.* We make no difficulty to ſay, That the *Worſhip of Images* and *Invocation of Saints* do alſo deſtroy this Foundation; becauſe there is no act of Religion that is not an Adoration. So Men cannot ſerve religiouſly any Creature, without violating this Command, *Thou ſhalt worſhip the Lord thy God, and him only ſhalt thou ſerve.*

2. I ſubjoyn, That the Fundamental Verities, wherein we agree with the *Roman* Church, cannot be a Means of Reunion with her, becauſe of the multitude of Opinions which ſhe hath added to thoſe Foundations; and that thoſe Additions are abſolutely oppoſed to the purity of the Faith. I ſay, that in retaining the Verities, which the *Roman* Church retains, and even ſome over and above, one might make a monſtrous Religion, and Soveraignty Idolatrous; for Example, Suppoſe that ſome Men ſhould believe that there is but One God, that we muſt adore None but him; that Jeſus Chriſt is the Redeemer of the World, that he is truly God, and truly Man; that there is a Paradiſe and a Hell, &c. But who ſhould perſwade himſelf, that all Creatures are united to God in ſo particular a manner, that they ought to be worſhipp'd with God; That the *Sun*, for Example, is the Eye of the Divinity; that in that quality he ought to be worſhipp'd; that the *Rivers* are his Arms, whereby he embraces the Earth, and becauſe of that one may Sacrifice to them: Thoſe People would ſay, *I worſhip but one God, I believe in Jeſus Chriſt; but I believe that that God is every where, and that God is All; and*

and becauſe of that, I adore that All, wherein he is. If the *Ubiquitans* in the Suppoſition they make, *That the Humanity of Chriſt is in all the Spaces and in all the Bodies*; ſhould come to conclude, *That Men muſt worſhip all the Bodies of the World,* would they not be Idolaters? Nevertheleſs they would retain all the Foundations of the Faith, which the *Roman* Church retains.

As for what they ſay, *That one muſt not impute unto People the Conſequences which they diſavow:* I Anſwer, That the queſtion is not here about Conſequences which ariſe from certain Errors which Men defend, but whereof they diſown the Reſults. The queſtion is of Conſequences owned, and that we may impute to them that avow them. Jeſus Chriſt *eſt reellement dans l'Euchariſtie.* Behold the Principle or Errour: Then muſt we adore the Sacrament; behold the Conſequence, and a Conſequence avowed. We muſt do all that the Church commands: Behold the Principle. Therefore we muſt ſerve Images and invoke Saints; behold the Conſequences which are owned. I might produce an hundred more, but theſe ſuffice me. I add thereto, That there are Conſequences, which though they be diſowned, they ceaſe not to ſubſiſt. Thoſe are they that ariſe from the very Actions and Practiſes. If a Man ſhould give a Box on the Ear to another, and ſay, that no wrong is done to another, but when one hath no right to ſtrike; and therefore denies to have done him wrong, becauſe it was not his Intention to wrong him, or becauſe he had right to ſtrike him; becauſe he denies the Conſequence, ſhall it be leſs true? The *Roman* Church invokes Saints, ſerves Images, adores the Sacrament of the Euchariſt. We tell her, *She offers injury to God, in imparting to Others a Worſhip which is due to him alone.* Thereupon ſhe Anſwers, *It's a Conſequence you*

draw, but what we deny; In Conſciente is ſuch a Juſtification to be received? We muſt diſtinguiſh well between Speculative Conſequences, which ariſe from a Doctrine; and thoſe that are Practical, and which ariſe from Worſhip. It's of the former that we muſt underſtand this Rule of Equity; That we muſt not impute Conſequences to thoſe that diſavow them. But that cannot be applied to the Conſequences of Practice. In fine, When we accuſe the *Roman* Church to do wrong to God, in imparting Adoration to others; to the Sacrifice of the Croſs, in adding another Sacrifice; to the Satisfaction of Jeſus Chriſt, in eſtabliſhing Human Satisfactions: It's not true that theſe things may be called Conſquences, and that we may be juſtified of that Accuſation by denying them. That is clear by this Example: If one divide the Authority of the Prince Soveraign, among his Subjects, without his Permiſſion; I maintain, That injury is done to him by that very thing; and that one ſhould not be received to ſay, *I deny I do injury to my Soveraign, in giving one part of his Soveraign Auhtority to Others.* That's a Conſequence which I diſown. The Injury conſiſts in the Act it ſelf that is done, and not in a Conſequence which ariſes from the Action. So to give a new Sacrifice, new Interceſſours, and new Objects of a Religious Worſhip, it's directly to offend God, the only Object of Religion. It's to oppoſe the Unity and Perfection of the Chriſtian Sacrifice. It's to do injury to the only Interceſſour; and that by the very Actions which are done, and not by Conſequences which ariſe from thoſe Actions.

But at leaſt, will they ſay, *You are obliged to grant, that the moſt part of the Errours of the* Roman *Church are not Capital.* Thereupon I ſay Three things: Firſt, That it's enough if there be two or three Capital Errours, and even One alone in a Religion, to render

render intolerable, that whith otherwiſe might have been tolerable. The Second thing that I ſay, is, that the Errours, which every one being apart might have been tolerated, if they were alone; cannot be born with when they are in a great Number. A Life that ſhould be wholly charged with thoſe Sins, which the *Roman* Church calls *Venial*, and that ſhould have no good Work at all, would undoubtedly lead to Eternal death; although every one of thoſe Sins taken apart would not deſtroy Grace. A Religion, that ſhould gather an infinite number of Practiſes, of Superſtitions and Errours, whereof none were Capital, could not be ſuffered nevertheleſs; for it is a Capital Affair to bury the Truth in ſo great a number of Errours. In fine. I ſay, that the *Roman* Church hath rendred Capital thoſe of her Errours; that would not otherwiſe be ſuch, ſince ſhe hath made Articles of Faith of them. She obliges, under pain of *Anathema*, that is to ſay, Pain of Eternal damnation, to believe that the Books of *Maccabees* are Canonical; that Concupiſcence after Baptiſm is no more Sin; that the involuntary Motions of that Concupiſcence are not Sins; that Baptiſm is of an abſolute neceſſity; that Order is a true Sacrament; that Marriage is not diſſolved by Adultery, and an hundred things of this Nature. If ſhe had received thoſe Opinions without obliging others to receive them. they might have been tolerated; but as ſoon as ſhe hath made them Articles of Faith, they become intolerable. For it's a mortal Sin, to receive Errours as Verities Fundamental. It's a horrid Crime to condemn to Hell Men that have but light Errours: Now the *Roman* Church, by her *Anathema's*, obliges me to damn thoſe who have but light Errours. In fine, It's a black baſeneſs, to make Profeſſion by Oath, to believe as Capital Verities and neceſſary Ones, ſuch Opinions as we know to be Er-

rours: And that is it the *Roman* Church would oblige us to. In a word, I think to Reaſon juſtly in Reaſoning thus. All the Articles of Faith are Fundamental Points, becauſe they cannot be rejected without being *Anathema's*. The *Roman* Church, of thoſe things which we might have conſidered as light Errours, hath made Articles of Faith, which may not be rejected without a direful *Anathema*. Then hath the *Roman* Church, in that regard, thoſe Opinions that could have paſs'd for being of little importance, Fundamental Points; and in our regard, Capital Errours. And from thence, it ſeems to me to be clear, that after the deciſions of the Council of *Trent*, all Reconciliation is impoſſible with the *Roman* Church. Becauſe the Queſtion is no more of tolerating light Errours; but to believe them, and make profeſſion thereof, and of damning all thoſe that believe them not; and that is it, which an honeſt Man and a Chriſtian cannot do.

ARTI-

ARTICLE IV.

That the Worſhip forbidden of God, cannot terminate in him.

BEhold the Second Principle of that Union, which my Lord of *Condom* propounds; it's, *That the Religious Worſhip in the Church of* Rome *terminates in God.* If the Honour ſhe gives to the Holy Virgin, and the Saints, may be called Religious, it's becauſe it relates neceſſarily to God. He would conclude thence, That in retaining our Principle, that every Religious Honour is to be related to God, we can, without hurt to our Conſcience, partake of the Worſhip of the *Roman* Church, ſeeing that ſhe teaches, *That every Religious Worſhip is to be referr'd to God, as to its neceſſary End.* Pag. 17.

1. I wiſh that my Lord of *Condom* had cited to us ſome Text of the Council of *Trent*, which might aſſure us, That all Religious Worſhip is terminated in God. I ſee there, that we muſt invoke Saints, becauſe they reign with Jeſus Chriſt, and becauſe they intercede for us, &c. I read there no more. I conceive there is a little difference between invoking a Saint for reference to God, and terminate a Religious Worſhip to God. It's true, that the *Roman* Church invokes Saints by reſpect to God, that is to ſay, becauſe they are the Saints of God, becauſe they govern under God, becauſe they have merited with God, becauſe they intercede before God for Men. If thoſe Saints ſhould have no relation to God, no doubt Men would not ſerve them. But is not this to impoſe viſibly upon the

World, to ſay, That becauſe of that all Religious Worſhip is terminated in God? Becauſe that a Favourite hath the Princes Ear, that he diſpoſes of the places of the State, under his Authority, that he obtains of him what he will, he is courted, a thouſand Homages are done to him; do thoſe Honours terminate in the Prince becauſe of that? Is he bound to own them and regard them, as if done to himſelf? A Man that would ſay ſuch a thing, would not he render himſelf ridiculous? Who ever heard, that Worſhip doth not terminate in that Perſon which is the immediate Object thereof? Thoſe Gentlemen conceive, that they have right to ſay what they pleaſe, and that we are bound to believe them on their Word.

2. But though it ſhould be the Intention of thoſe that invoke Saints to terminate all their Worſhip in God, would that Intention ſuffice to effect the thing? If it were ſo, there would never have been any Idolaters, that is to ſay, Perſons that had adored Images or Idols. For there was never any Religion ſo brutiſh, as to terminate their Worſhip upon *Braſs* or *Wood*, *Silver* or *Gold*, whereof the Image is compounded. If any Perſon have done it, it muſt not be imputed to the Religion. Thoſe Idolaters referr'd their Worſhip to the Deity, which was repreſented by the Idol. The *Iſraelites* had not offended God in the Worſhip of the Golden Calf; for it's as certain, as any thing can be ſo, that their Adoration was referr'd to that God, who had brought them out of *Egypt*, whom they had deſign to adore under the Sign of that *Calf*. In fine, A Man that ſhould take a Tree, a Dog, a Horſe, and ſhould adore him, referring his Worſhip to God in his Intention, would not be guilty, for his Worſhip would terminate in God. We muſt know then, that to the end our Adoration may terminate

minate in God, it ſuffices not that it be the Intention of him that adores; but God muſt accept that Adoration. Nothing terminates in God, but what God is willing to receive. It's uſeleſs to have an Intention to ſerve God by certain Actions, if thoſe Actions be condemn'd of God; they are againſt him, and not for him.

Methinks I have read, in the very Theology of thoſe Gentlemen, *That the infinite Baſeneſs of Sin ariſes from its eſtabliſhing our laſt End different from God.* So every Sin, ſo far as in it lies, ſnatches away God from his Throne, in taking away from him the Title of *Ultimate End*, to give it the Creature; and that is an infinite Crime. But what ſhall we ſay to ſo many Actions Criminal, that have God's Honour for their Object? Of thoſe Bloody Perſecutions which have ſhed the Blood of the Faithful, with the Thought, That they did therein Service to God? Of ſo many Superſtitions, which have been practiſed to the Honour of the Deity? How can thoſe Crimes be accuſed of ſetting up another End, beſides God, ſeing they are done in honour to God? It's nevertheleſs certain, that thoſe Actions do not terminate in God; and there is no other reaſon for it, but that he abhors them, and hath forbidden them. They terminate then in the Vanity of their Imaginations, and in the Illuſions of the heart of thoſe falſe Zealots, and of that bad Devotion, and do not reach God. Semblably, the Worſhip that Men render to the Creatures, with Intention of referring it to God, is carried out to the Creatures themſelves, becauſe that God ſuffers it not to reach unto himſelf.

Here my Lord of *Condom* makes a Courſe into Antiquity, and will draw his advantage from thence, in that we acknowledge, *That Men began to invocate Saints about the end of the Fourth Century.* But that

is a Proof, and not an Explication. I have not obliged my ſelf to follow him through all. I'le only ſay, That then they did not invocate Saints, as they do at this day. They did not pray to them in the Ordinary Service. They conſtrained none thereto, they did not build Temples to them, they did not Sacrifice the Body of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt to their honour. Moreover, we profeſs, that we will only imitate the Apoſtles and their immediate Succeſſors.

ARTICLE V.

Of the Invocation of the Saints.

ALL that is general. My Lord of *Condom* begins to deſcend to Particulars. The Invocation and Worſhip of Saints, is aſſuredly one of the things that doth moſt ſeparate us from the *Roman* Church. Mean while, if he be believed, the vain Terrors that we conceive therein, proceed only from their having given an ill Turn to an Action the moſt innocent of all. It's nothing to ſee that Religious Worſhip that ſhould be intirely given to God, divided between Him and a thouſand Creatures. It's nothing to hear *Matins*, *Maſſes*, *Veſpers*, filled with Litanies, Songs and Praiſes, that tend to the honour of thoſe Creatures. It's nothing to ſee thoſe *Devoti*, who having almoſt wholly neglected the Name of God, do cauſe to reſound in their Exerciſes of Piety only the Names of the holy Mother of God, and of other Saints. It's nothing to ſee the Kalendar crouded with an infinite number of Days dedicated to the honour of Saints, whilſt that

God

God hath appropriated to himſelf but fifty or fifty two. All Religion is to be for God, all firſt Notions are for that. *Pietas erga Parentes*, *Religio erga Deum*, ſaid the Pagans themſelves. Yet it's nothing to give Religious Worſhip to the Creatures, and to divide Religion between God and them. My Lord of *Condom* hath prevented that difficulty, telling us, *That this Worſhip is called Religious only, becauſe it terminates in God.* But I think alſo we have Anſwered it ſufficiently, and have well proved, That Worſhips forbidden of God cannot be referr'd to him.

Behold another Colour, which is diffuſed thereon. The Church in telling us, [*That it's uſeful to pray to Saints, teaches us to pray to them with the ſame Spirit of Charity, and according to thoſe Orders of fraternal Charity, which carries us on to demand the Succour of our Brethren living on the Earth. We pray to them in the ſame Spirit, that we pray to our Brethren that are on Earth, to pray with us and for us to our Common Maſter, in the Name of our Common Mediatour Jeſus Chriſt. Therefore, according to the Catechiſm of the Council of Trent, we uſe two Forms of Prayer very different; ſeeing that whereas in praying to God, the proper manner is to ſay,* Have mercy on us; Hear us: *We are content to ſay to the Saints,* Pray for us.] There is nothing more ſpecious. That is reduced to Two. things: One, That they invoke Saints, but in ſaying to them, *Pray for us.* The other, *That this Prayer is put up with the ſame Spirit, that it's done to the Saints that are on Earth.* Thoſe Gentlemen ſhould know, that though all that were true, yet could not we be ſatisfied; for in matter of Religion, we would have nothing but what is founded on Precept or Example. God hath not commanded

Expoſit. pag. 19, 20.

Advertiſement, p. 50.

us any where to invocate glorified Saints, in the same Spirit, that we pray our Brethren that are on Earth to pray for us. Besides, they being perfectly assured, that Souls separate from their Bodies do not understand us, Reason would forbid us loading our Service with useless Invocations.

But it's a strange thing, that they will still produce to us the same Facts, with so much confidence, without having answer'd the Proofs that we bring to the contrary. To see that air of Assurance, wherewith these Gentlemen say, we say nothing else to the Saints, but *Pray for us*; would not one believe that there is nothing more true? Yet let him but read the Books of Devotion of the *Roman* Church, to be soon perswaded of the contrary. Why then in the Hymn, that begins, *Exultat Cœlum laudibus, &c.* do they say to the Apostles, [*You that shut up Heavens by your Word, and who open them at your Command, loosen us of our Sins, we pray you for it: You that have power over Health and Sickness of all, heal us of our ill Manners, and inspire Vertues into us.*] In the Hymn which begins, *Lux Mundi beatissima*, do not they speak thus to the Virgin, [*We pray you with a Suppliant Voice, that you would please to be present with us? Come sweet Lady, deliver us out of all our Evils, and bestow on us the Gifts of Heaven.*] In the Hymn called, *Maris Stella*, they say, [*Oh singular Virgin, Debonnair among all, defend us from our Guils, render us Chaste and Mild, give us a pure Life, prepare us in the sure Way, to the end, that seeing Jesus, we may enjoy an eternal Joy.*] We have an hundred times reproached those Gentlemen, that of *Jure Matris impera*, of the Old *Missals*, and the *Monstra te esse Matrem*; but we shall still have right to reproach them therewith, till satisfaction be given us by Reason for it. Instead thereof they renew the same, and publish them in French,

French, that none might be ignorant thereof; [*Oh bend, by thy power, both of Mother and Queen, thy Son and our King*:] That is but from the Year 1672. Methinks the Date is freſh enough, and that they ſhould not accuſe us to have digg'd up Books buried in Oblivion, and old Exceſſes, that are no more in uſe. One ſhould Copy and Tranſcribe all the *Miſſals*, *Breviaries*, and all other Books of Devotion, if one would relate all. Why then do thoſe Gentlemen ſay, They only pray the Saints to pray for us? [*It's*, ſay they, *that in whatever Terms the Prayers are conceived that we addreſs to Saints, the Intention of the Church, and of her Faithful Ones, ſtill reduces them to that form.*] Its long ſince *Bellarmine* had adviſed us thereof. As for Words, it's permitted to ſay, *Oh St.*Peter *have mercy on me, ſave me, open me the Gate of Heaven; give me health of Body, give me patience, give me Courage, &c.* So that we underſtand, Save us and ſhew us Mercy, in praying for us. That might ſurprize us indeed.

Office of the Church of Paris, *with Petit.* 1672. pag. 430.

Expoſit. pag. 22.

De Beatitud. Sanctorum. lib. 1. cap. 17.

Firſt, I would fain know, what would theſe Gentlemen ſay of a Man, that would ſay in good earneſt to *St.*Peter, *Save me, and pardon my Sins*; without reducing them to this Form, *St.*Peter, *pray for me.* By thoſe things which my Lord of *Condom* ſaith, I have cauſe to believe, he would look on him as an Idolater; for he ſaith, that the Church teaches, [*That Men muſt cleave to God, as to Him who alone can make up our felicity, by the Communication of an Infinite Good, which is himſelf.*] But is it not a terrible thing to put into the Mouth of the People ſuch *Formularies*,

Expoſit. pag. 14.

as

as do caſt them every day into the peril of Idolatry? Where are the Men that are not naturally carried to take Words in their Literal ſenſe? The Literal ſenſe of theſe Words of St. *Peter*, *Save me*, *Pardon me*, carries Men to believe, that St. *Peter* can Save and Pardon. Muſt a ſimple Man have ſtill at his Ear an Interpreter, to tell him, *Take heed of taking theſe Words in their Literal ſenſe; you would commit an act of Idolatry; reduce theſe Prayers to the Senſe of the Church.* In a word, I never could conceive what Prudence there can be in hiding a pious and devout Senſe under Expreſſions altogether Criminal; Is it not to lay a Snare continually for the Souls of the Simple?

2. If Saints have no other Charge than that of Praying to God for us, why are they made the Governours of the World under God? It's a Theſis that *Bellarmine* maintains with divers Proofs, and which is not conteſted; *That the Faithful alive are not only conducted and governed by Angels, but alſo by the bleſſed Spirits.* Another Author [*That if Kings deſtroy Armies of Enemies, if the Rich relieve the Poor, if Phyſicians with their Art heal Maladies; Saints can do the ſame thing, as well as the Angels, whereof one killed 185000 in one Night; another reſtored Sight to* Toby, *and a third delivered St.* Peter *from Priſon.*] Governours do not always go to the Prince to preſent him the Requeſts of Suppliants; they act of themſelves according to the extent of their Commiſſion.

De Beatid. Sanct. lib. 1. cap. 18.

Coſter. *Enchirid. Controverſ.* cap. 12. pag. 4.

3. If Saints have no Superintendency on Inferiour things, why then are Kingdoms, Towns, Families, and particular Perſons put under their Protection? Why have Mens ſeveral Conditions, differing Arts and differing Evils, their particular Saints? St. *Luke* is Patron

tron of Physicians, St. *Yves* of Advocates, St. *Crispin* of Shoemakers. They that are in danger of Shipwrack invoke St. *Nicholas*, Bishop of *Myre*. Women in labour pray to St. *Margaret*. St. *Roch* is prayed to for the Plague; and St. *Apollony* for the Toothach. All that clearly supposes, that the Saints have received Commission under God, to have care of certain Persons, and to preside over certain things; for otherwise, the first coming to hand of all the Saints would suffice to receive the Prayers of Men in whatever place they were, and present them to God. They do then something by themselves.

4. If all Devotion for Saints be reduced to saying to them, *Pray for us*; why have they censur'd, the Saving Advices of the Virgin to her indiscreet *Devoti*? For, in fine, that Author had no other Aim, but to bring thither the Prayers of Devout ones. He would have them say, [*Holy Mother of God, supply by your Praises, near the Almighty, what our weakness cannot render to him, and obtain for me, from your beloved, the Grace to know, &c.*] Yet hath that Book been censur'd at *Rome* and in *Spain*, as containing *Propositions* suspected of Errour, some Impieties and abuses of Scripture, as withdrawing the Faithful from piety and Devotion to the Mother of God, and from her Invocation. This last word is very remarkable: That Book withdraws from the Invocation of the Virgin. He withdraws not from that Invocation, *Pray to God for us*; on the contrary, he gives a Formulary expres to invoke her so. He withdraws then from the Invocation of the Virgin only, because he would not have them to ask of her directly those things, as if she were the Disposer thereof. *Preface to the Book of Father* Cresset.

5. Finally,

5. Finally, If the Senſe of the Church be, That Men pray the Saints to pray for us, and no more, why do they not cenſure ſo many Authors that tell us neatly, That Saints give, forgive, ſave, and diſtribute Graces themſelves? *Cyſterus* writing on the Hymn, *Ave Maris Stella*, and explaining theſe words, *Looſen the Bonds of the Guilty*, thus Gloſſes thereon, *Solve Precibus, Solve Merito, Solve Auboritate, Solve Imperio; Looſen with thy Prayers, Looſen by thy Merit, Looſen by thine Authority, Looſen by thy Command.* I am tempted to add here all the like ſayings of *Bonaventure, Gerſon, Cajetan, Albert, Ozorius, Salazar, Bernardine de Buſtis*, and *of Sienna, Driedo*, Father *Binet, Viega, Gabriel Biel, Antonine*, and an hundred others; that is to ſay, the Ancients and Moderns, the leſſer, the great and middle Authors. But I will not yield to that Temptation, for it would be an infinite work, and we ſhall ſee anon that Father *Creſſet* hath ſpared us that labour.

When they ſpeak to us face to face, they tell us, Thoſe are brave Authors indeed: Muſt we judge of the Senſe of the Church by little popular Books, which ignorant *Bigots* put into the Peoples hands? They are fallen into thoſe Exceſſes which honeſt Men do condemn. Yet theſe brave Authors are Canonized Saints; they are called St. *Bonaventure*, St. *Antonine*, St. *Bernardine*. They dare not publickly condemn, what they privately cenſure. So all things do ſtill remain; and if any venture to publiſh any Writing againſt theſe Devouts, it's preſently cenſur'd and ſuppreſs'd. After that, they would have us on the credit of four Words, drawn out of a Catechiſm, which the Council of *Trent* never ſaw nor approved, we ſhould belie our Eyes againſt what we read, and what's daily done before us.

We

We ask pardon of my Lord of *Condom*, and of the Author of the Advertiſement; but we are bound to believe, that their Church doth not ſimply invocate Saints as Interceſſours, but as Governours and Directors, who diſtribute according to Gods Orders all the Good and Evil that befall the World. We will believe, that he and many others would fain have things to go otherwiſe. But in fine, they go ſo, and apparently they will go ſo ſtill, yet for a long time. The Archbiſhop, and the Biſhop of ſuch and ſuch a place, ſuffer not that to be done in their Dioceſs, ſay they to us. That may be, but an Archbiſhop, and ſome Biſhops, are not all the *Roman* Church; and maugre the Care of ſome Prelates of *France*, the Devotion of Convents and Monks fails not to carry it on upon their Inſtructors. And freely what may be ſaid of Father *Creſſet's Devoti*, it's that they follow the Principles of their Religion; they ſhew it as clear as the day, and the others forſake them.

Behold the ſecond Excuſe of my Lord of *Condom*; *We pray to the Saints glorified in the ſame Spirit, wherein we pray the faithful, which are on the Earth, to pray for us.* This is a thing that I admire. I had believed hitherto, that a Cauſe remaining the ſame, ſhould produce the ſame effects. If Men invoke the Saints which are in Heaven, in the ſame Spirit wherein they pray the Saints that are on Earth, why ſhould not the ſame Spirit produce the ſame Effects? In Conſcience what would theſe Gentlemen ſay, ſhould they ſee a Man invoke one of his Friends, or of his Neighbours, of whoſe Sanctity he ſhould have a good Opinion, build Temples or Chappels to him, name them with his Name, erect Altars to him, place him or his Images on thoſe Altars, proſtrate himſelf at his feet, kiſs them, and make devout Prayers to him, conſecrate Holy Days to him, place him in his Oratories,

tories, make long Pilgrimages to proſtrate himſelf before him, celebrate the Sacrifice of the Maſs in his honour, and requeſt his Merits and his Mediation before God; it's not enough to ſay, That ſuch a Man would paſs for a Mad man; I am aſſured he would paſs for an Idolater. Yet would he ſay, *I invoke and I ſerve this living Saint, with the ſame Spirit wherewith you ſerve the glorious Saints. I have no other End, but to oblige him to have care of me in his Prayers,* Muſt there be ſo many Myſteries to ſollicite the Charity of Saints, who burn with Zeal for the Salvation of the whole Church? How can Men ſay, that Conducts more different than day and night, ſhould proceed from one and the ſame Spirit?

The Illuſion which theſe Gentlemen would put upon us conſiſts then, in that they repreſent this Service, which they render to Saints, not ſo much as an Invocation, but ſimply as a Prayer, that we would preſent to a Friend to pray for us. And they do not advertize us, *That the Service, which is rendred to Saints, is a Religious Service, which embraces all the ſpecies of Services which are rendred to God, Prayer, Confidence, Love, Praiſes and Kneelings.* We cannot but complain, there is no fair dealing in comparing things that are ſo different. Was there ever any Man, which hath called the Prayer preſented to a Saint upon Earth for to pray for us, a Service, how much leſs a Religious Service! My Lord of *Condom* grants, *Expoſit.* pag. 15. *That the Honour rendred to the Holy Virgin, and to the Saints, may be called Religious.* Would he alſo grant the ſame thing of the honour that is done to a Saint on Earth, when he is pray'd to pray God for us? If thoſe Gentlemen would but ſay things as they know them, would they not grant, that the Worſhip that Men render

render to Saints is a kind of Religious Adoration? and doth not my Lord of *Condom* grant it, when he ſaith, That [*in a ſenſe Adoration belongs only to God and to Jeſus Chriſt; and that one may, in regard of that ſenſe, abuſe thoſe terms to render their Doctrine odious: but if we reduce ſincerely thoſe terms to the ſenſe they give to them, Objections then loſe all their force.*] Do they not diſtinguiſh *Adoration* and *Worſhip*, in that of *Latria*, *Hyperdulia*, and *Dulia*? The firſt is for God, the ſecond for the Virgin *Mary*, the third for other Saints. When a Gender is divided into its Species, each of the Species may have the Name of the Genus. If Religious Adoration be divided into *Latria* and *Dulia*, then may *Dulia* retain the Name of *Adoration*. *It's infinitely diſtant*, ſay they, *from the Adoration of* Latria, *which is given only to God*. We are not agreed about that infinite diſtance; but though there were the greateſt difference of the one to the other, that would not hinder, but both the one and the other might bear the Name of *Adoration*. There is a great diſtance between Man and Beaſt; nevertheleſs, doth this merit to bear the Name of Animal as well as that? Father *Creſſet* hath not ſcrupled that; for he ſaith freely, that there are three ſorts of Religious Adoration, and that one muſt not only honour the Saints, but that he muſt adore them. *Expoſit. pag.* 44.

Finally, To convince thoſe Gentlemen, the little Equity they ſhew, in comparing the honour which we give to the Faithful, when we recommend our ſelves to their Prayers, to that which is rendred to the Saints: I would pray them to conſider, what would be ſaid of a Man, that of his own Authority ſhould Canonize a Dead man, ſhould build Temples and Altars to him, and cauſe him to be publickly ſerv'd? I am aſſured,

aſſured, that there would not be Thunders enough in the *Vatican* to ſtrike him down, although he were well aſſured of the beatitude of his Saint by a Revelation. For it's not permitted to ſet any Perſon in the Kalendar, nor make him to be ſerved and invoked publickly, before a ſolemn Canonization iſſuing from the Holy Seat. But I would alſo willingly know, if Men have need of Patents from *Rome*, for permiſſion to ſay in all occaſions, publick or private, to a Faithful alive, *Pray for me?* There muſt be many Myſteries towards the one, and none to the other. Who ſees not then, that they put a prodigious difference between Serving or Invoking a glorified Saint, and recommending One ſelf to the Prayers of a living Saint? And that things ſo different cannot be done in the ſame Spirit.

In fine, Either let them tell us no more of the Service of the Saints, as of a little buſineſs, and as of a Worſhip that cannot damnifie Piety, or let them give us ſatisfaction for Father *Creſſet's* Book, who ſaith, [*That God ordinarily imparts no Grace to Men, but by the Interceſſion of his Mother; and that ſhe prays ordinarily but for thoſe that invoke her, and are devout towards her.*] And that ſo, all thoſe that are not devout toward the Virgin, cannot be ordinarily ſaved; becauſe that God, beſides the Prayers of his Son, would have our Salvation to depend on his Mother. He approves what *Salazar* ſaith, *That God hath made a Decree, not to confer his Grace to any Man, but at the Interceſſion of* Mary. And what *Suarez* ſaith, That ſhe cooperates to our Salvation in three manners, *viz. That ſhe hath merited the Incarnation, That ſhe pray'd for us on Earth,* and *That ſhe Sacrificed her Son willingly for the Salvation of Men.* He likes

Tract. 1. *pag.* 2.

Pag. 23.

Pag. 34.

Pag. 36.

likes it that Men ſhould ſay, *That all Power belongs to her in Heaven and on Earth, that nothing is impoſſible to her,* and *that ſhe can ſave the moſt deſperate: That ſhe approackes God's Tribunal, not only as a Servant praying to her Lord, but as a Mother commanding her Son. That ſhe hath a kind of Jurisdiction upon the temporal Proceſſions of the Holy Ghoſt, that the Spouſe hath a right on the Goods of the Spouſe; that the Virgin being the Spouſe of the Holy Ghoſt, ſhe hath right to the diſtribution of his Graces, and a part in his Communication. So that no Creature hath received any Vertue or Grace from God, which hath not been diſpenſed by the hands of this Charitable Mother; that Devotion to the Virgin is a mark of Predeſtination; that a* Devoto *of the Virgin cannot be damned; that a buſineſs cannot fail when it is in the hand of the Virgin. That ſhe can command Jeſus Chriſt by Authority of a Mother; that ſhe yet retains a kind Maternal Authority upon his Perſon, his Goods, and all his Power. That one muſt ſay roundly and without mincing, with* Arnold of Chartres *and* Richard of St. Lawrence, *That ſhe can do all that her Son can do; becauſe the Son and the Mother having but one Fleſh, they poſſeſs individually the ſame Power, the Son by Nature, the Mother by Grace. That though the Virgin hate the Sin, yet ſhe loves the Sinners engaged in the greateſt Crimes, and hath tenderneſs for them; that there is no Man, though never ſo wicked, who whilſt he is on Earth is forſaken of her Mercy: That ſhe gets Souls out of Hell,* that is, *ſhe hath kept from deſcending*

Pag. 28.

Pag. 37, 38.

Pag. 39, 54.

Pag. 58. 60.

Pag. 61.

Pag. 86.

Pag. 100.

into

into Hell the Souls of Profligates and Thieves, already ſevered from their Bodies, and hath wrought Miracles to give them time to do Penance after their death, becauſe they had been devoted to her. Its there they find the admirable Hiſtory of that Thief, whoſe Head was cut off, and whoſe Head ſevered from his Body began to cry, *Confeſſion, Confeſſion, Confeſſion.* After which they had time to ſend for a Prieſt of the next Town, and to ſet the Head on the Body. The Thief reported, *That as ſoon as his Head was cut off, the Devils immediately caſt themſelves upon his Soul, but that the Virgin ſaved her from their Claws, becauſe he had faſted on Saturday to her Honour.* It's there alſo that they find the Miracle wrought in the Perſon of a Souldier, who had always been moſt devout to the Virgin. He was murthered, and re-

Pag. 104. mained ſeveral years under a Buſh; the fleſh of his Karkaſs was eaten away, and the Thorns had paſſed quite through his Body: Yet his Soul remained within, by the Virgins favour, till that Corps found means to confeſs himſelf. Another Man fallen into the *Danube*, was three days in the bottom of the Water; but at laſt he

Pag. 105. heard a Voice, which ſaid to him, O *Man, thou meriteſt to loſe thy life, and to be damned for thy Crimes; but becauſe thou art a Servant of the Mother of God, thou ſhalt be delivered from this danger, that thou maiſt confeſs thy ſelf.* It's there alſo that Father *Creſſet* aſſures us, That it cannot be denied, without raſhneſs, that many Children died without Baptiſm, many Idolaters dead in their Idolatries, and conſequently deſcended into Hell, have been raiſed up by the favour of the Saints and of the Virgin, to receive Baptiſm and to do Pennance, that they might be received into Heaven. It's that Father *Creſſet* that prays thus to the Virgin, *Mother of Mercy*

Mercy have pity on me, &c. Preſerve me in your Family; if I wander, redreſs me; if I combat, defend me; if I be wracked, ſave me, receive my Soul into your hands. It is he that ſaith, *That the dignity of the Virgin is in ſome ſort infinite. That Men muſt give a Religious Adoration to the Saints and to the Angels; that all Adoration is a kind of Honour, but that all Honour is not Adoration. That it's not enough to honour the Saints, but that we muſt adore them too. That we owe to the Virgin that kind of Adoration which is called* Hyperdulia; *that the quality of* Mother of God *renders her worthy of Adoration; that the Angels adore the Virgin, and have adored her even before ſhe was in the World. That Temples muſt be built to her, Feaſts conſecrated, and Vows made.*

Methinks the leaſt honour that can be done to a Religious man, of Father *Creſſet's* Learning, who hath above a thouſand Citations of Authors ancient and modern, is to believe, that he knows his Religion, the leaſt thing that can be granted to a Provincial of a famous Order, who hath given Approbation to the Examinators, appointed by the King to grant the Priviledges to the Archbiſhop of *Paris*, who thought fit that his Printer ſhould attend this Work, is to believe, that they knew their Religion: When ſhould they know it, if they knew it not in the Year 1679. after it hath been ſo examined, ſo attack'd, and ſo defended? Whence is it that Father *Creſſet* hath not profited by the Expoſitions of my Lord of *Condom*? How dares he expoſe to the view of all the Earth a Book that carries its Condemnation in the Forehead, by the Oppoſition he hath to the Book of the *Expoſition of the Catholick Doctrine, approved by the Pope*? We cannot ſufficiently admire the Providence of God, who labours for our Juſtification, and uſes the *Roman* Church her ſelf to diſſipate all the Diſguiſes, whereby

they would ſteal from us the knowledge of their Worſhip and of their Devotions. Would we have yet another Witneſs beſides Father *Creſſet?* We have the Author of the *Saving Advices of the Holy Virgin to her indiſcreet Devouts:* It's one of thoſe moderate Catholicks, who diſapproves the Exceſſes of the Virgins Devouts. That Author grants, *That the People, the Prelates, the Doctors and Preachers, do honour the Virgin as a Second Deity; that they render her a Worſhip which is due to God only; that they put their whole truſt in her; that they lift her up above her Son; that they give her all the glory of our Salvation.* It's Father *Creſſet* himſelf that teaches us that. And when ſhould we have done, if we would cite all that Father *Mainbourg*, in his Hiſtory of the *Iconoclaſtæ*; and what ſo many others have ſaid lately to eſtabliſh that Worſhip of the Virgins and of the Saints. For in fine, Let any one viſit the Preſſes and Libraries of St. *Jame's* Street, or go to *Michallet* or all the others, let him ſee if ever more Books were printed fit to nouriſh People in the Worſhip of Saints, and entertain them in thoſe Exceſſes, that Men fain to condemn. It's there, that Men ſhall find the Slavery of the Admirable Mother of God; the Worſhip and Veneration which is due to the Nine Orders of the Celeſtial Hierarchy; the Life of St. *Joſſe*, and that of St. *Peter*; the *Chaplet*, or perpetual Adoration of the moſt Holy Sacrament; *l'Abbriegé del Indulgences*; the Statutes of the Brothers and Siſters of the Third Order of the Holy Trinity, and Redemption of Captives; the Myſteries of the Virgin; the Panegyricks of St. *Roſe* by the Father *Oliva*, General of the Jeſuites. All theſe Books, and a thouſand others are newly printed; and there we find a Theology and Devotions, which ſhould cauſe a true Grief to them that are truly jealous of the Glory of God and of his Honour.

Nothing

Nothing is more capable to make us ſee in what Spirit Men ſerve and invoke the Saints, than the Sacrifice of the Maſs, which they celebrate to their Honour. My Lord of *Condom* makes an Article thereof, and turns the thing to the faireſt ſide; let him not take it ill, if we examine it in its Native ſtate. That they may not accuſe us of Calumniating, I will repreſent here the very Words of the Council of *Trent*:

If any one maintain, that it's an abuſe to celebrate Maſſes to the honour of Saints, and to obtain their Interceſſion with God, as the Church underſtands, let him be Anathema. Here is happily the ſtrangeſt thing in the World, and which hath not been well conſidered of to this day. Seſſ. 22. Can. 5.

They offer a Sacrifice to the honour of a Creature. It's true that the Council of *Trent* ſaith formally, that they offer not Sacrifices to Saints. But theſe Gentlemen will permit us to obſerve that in every Tongue, to do Service to ſome Perſon, or to do it in honour of that Perſon, ſignifie the ſame thing. We ſay, The Pagans have built Temples to their Falſe gods, and to the honour of their Falſe gods: They have eſtabliſhed Feaſts to the honour of *Demons*, and to *Demons*; they have made Sacrifices to Idols, and to the honour of Idols. We believe then, that we ſay by the ſecond Expreſſion the ſame thing as by the firſt. Men do not ſpeak otherwiſe in the World. They ſay, Men have erected a Statue to the Prince, or to the honour of the Prince; they have put up this Triumphers Ark to the King, or to the honour of the King. Thoſe Gentlemen muſt make us Vocabularies quite new, and advertize us, that they are not pleaſed to ſpeak like all Mankind. Let's a little unravel this confuſed Idea. [*They may offer the Sacrifice of the Maſs to the honour of a Saint, by the hand of a Prieſt.*]

Prieſt.] That is to ſay, They may offer a God to our God, to the honour of a Creature by the hands of another Creature. The Victim is God the Son; he to whom they offer him is God the Father; he to whoſe honour he is offered, it's a Saint, a Creature; and he that offers is a Prieſt, that is to ſay, another Creature. If that be not called, to go againſt the Order obſerved in all the Religions of the World, I know not how it may be called. In every Religion, Men obſerve in all their Sacrifices a certain gradation of Dignity among theſe Three things; The Miniſter of the Sacrifice; the Oblation; and he to whoſe Honour the Oblation is offered. The Oblation is always the leaſt excellent; for before time, they were only Animals. He that offered was much more excellent, becauſe it was a Man. But laſtly, He to whoſe honour the Sacrifice was offered, was infinitely greater than the Prieſt, ſeeing they conſidered him as God. And even this Order is found in this admirable Sacrifice of the Croſs, which ſeems to be gone beyond all Rules. The Human Nature, which is the Victim, is in the loweſt degree of Dignity: The Lord Jeſus Chriſt, as God and Man together, is the Sacrificer, and under that regard he is more than the Victim. In fine, He in whoſe honour this Sacrifice is offered, it is God, who is ſuperiour both to the Victim and to the Sacrificer. For although the Lord Jeſus Chriſt be equal in all things to his Father, by his Divinity; yet conſidered as God and Man, he is Inferiour; and its in this regard, that he ſaith, *The Father is greater than I.* But in the Sacrifice which they celebrate to the honour of Saints, this Order is turn'd upſide down. The Victim is infinitely more excellent than he to whoſe Honour it is offered; for they offer the Body of Jeſus Chriſt to the honour of Saints.

Behold

Behold a thing which may yet ſeem more incomprehenſible. The Council of *Trent* ſaith, *That Jeſus Chriſt, who offered himſelf on the Croſs, is the ſame who offers himſelf this day by the Miniſtry of the Prieſts; that is to ſay, that Jeſus Chriſt offers himſelf; he is then properly the Sacrificer. His Sacrifice is celebrated to the honour of the Saints; thence it follows, that Jeſus Chriſt offers himſelf to his Father to the honour of the Saints. To offer to the honour of the Saints, it is to honour and to ſerve them.* So Jeſus Chriſt, who is the Maſter and the Creator, ſerves and honours the Saints, which are the Creatures, in Sacrificing himſelf to their honour. Methinks this Conſequence comes not far, yet it appears to me terrible.

Here is another that is but little leſs. *In all Sacrifices the Sacrificer is the Suppliant, and he that demands favours. He to whoſe honour men offer, is the Perſon of whom theſe favours are demanded; and the Victim is the Means, by which the Suppliant inclines him, of whom he demands. Here, the end is to implore the Protection of the Saints, and to obtain their Interceſſion with God.* They are the very words of the Council. *He that labours to obtain this Grace is the Sacrificer, and this Sacrificer is Jeſus Chriſt, the Victim; by means whereof he eſſays to obtain this Grace, it is his Body and Blood.* Gather all theſe things together, and ſay, *The Son of God, God himſelf bleſſed for ever, offers to God the Sacrifice of his Body and of his Blood, to obtain from a Saint his Protection and his Interceſſion for the Faithful.* According to that, is it not true, that Jeſus Chriſt renders himſelf Mediator and Interceſſour with the Saints, for to obtain of thoſe Saints the Grace of their Interceſſion for the Faithful? Can there be any thing more oppoſite to the Rules of right Reaſon? Seſſ. 22. c. 3. & Can. 3.

5. Here is a turn of Devotion to obtain ſomething of God, which deſerves to be admired. They preſent to God a Sacrifice, for to obtain the Protection of Saints and their Interceſſion with God. It's that which is expreſſed by theſe Words of the Maſs: *Reverencing the Memory of the glorious always Virgin* Mary, *Mother of our God and Lord Jeſus Chriſt; and alſo of thy bleſſed Apoſtles and Martyrs, &c. by whoſe Prayers and by whoſe Names we pray thee, that we may be furniſhed with the ſuccour of thy Protection.* Either I comprehend nothing therein, or that ſignifies, That one goes firſt directly to God in offering directly the Sacrifice to him; then God moved by the Sacrifice, muſt turn himſelf towards the Saints, and being appeaſed by the Sacrifice, he obtains of the Saints to intercede with Jeſus Chriſt, to the intent, that in fine the Lord Jeſus Chriſt may intercede with him for them which have offered the Sacrifice. Is it not true, that this courſe is a ſingular one? For if God be already moved and appeaſed by the Sacrifice, why muſt he turn to the Saints, for to oblige them to intercede for thoſe People, towards whom he is already appeaſed? In a word, what I conceive of it is, That the *Roman* Church offers to God their Redeemer and Mediatour Jeſus Chriſt, that ſo God may render himſelf as Mediatour with the Saints, to oblige them to become Interceſſours and Mediatours for Men, with him. I beſeech theſe Gentlemen to regard that with an unintereſt'd Eye.

6. I cannot finiſh without returning again to the diſtinction, whereby they believed they might diſentangle themſelves of all troubles and perplexities. It's, that they indeed offer the Sacrifice to the honour of Saints, but they offer it to God alone. If thoſe Sacrifices be offered only to God, I ſee not what honour redounds thence to the Saint. I conceive well, that there

there is a Senſe wherein it's true to ſay, that in honouring the Maſter men honour the Servant. It's a great honour to a Servant to appertain to a puiſſant Maſter, to whom all the World pays homage; and I conſent, that we may ſay in this Senſe, that in adoring God we honour the Saints. But ſincerely, is that the Senſe wherein they ſay, they offer to God the Sacrifice of the Maſs to the honour of Saints? If that were true, all the Prayers and all the Acts of *Latria*, that thoſe Gentlemen preſent to God, ſhould be done to the honour of the Saints. Now it's not ſo ſaid: If the Sacrifice of the Maſs were done in honour to the Saints meerly by way of reflexion, becauſe the Saints ſhould receive Honour and Joy to have a Maſter that is adored, all the Maſſes ſhould equally honour all the Saints: For they have equally Honour and Joy from all the Acts of Adoration that are rendred to God. But this is not the thought of theſe Gentlemen; for there are certain Maſſes which are offered to the honour of the Saints, and others not. The Maſs of St. *Peter* is not ſaid to the honour of St. *Roch*, and the Maſs of St. *Anthony* doth not honour St. *Paul*. This Conſideration gives us cauſe to believe, that beſides the reflex honour which comes to the Saint from the celebration of the Maſs; there is alſo a direct Honour, that goes ſtrait to him. And conſequently, my Lord of *Condom* muſt not think it ſtrange, that we look upon that as upon a Capital Affair; ſeeing that all Chriſtians hold this Principle, *That the honour of Sacrifices is to be reſerved to the Deity.* After this, if any be drawn into this Snare, That the Invocation of Saints is done in the ſame Spirit, as the Prayers that we make to the Faithful upon Earth to pray for us; I'le ſay without difficulty, that he deſigns to deceive himſelf.

I have been ſomewhat long upon this Chapter of the *Invocation of Saints*; yet I cannot leave it without making two important reflexions. The firſt is upon the Council of *Trent*, which hath uſed moderate Terms to eſtabliſh this Invocation, and which do not neceſſarily carry men to all the Exceſſes that we have blamed. Thereupon I ſay two things: Firſt, That the Council of *Trent*, which hath authorized this great Abuſe, to offer the Sacrifice of the Body of Chriſt to the honour of Saints, by that alone hath authorized all the reſt: for I eſteem all the reſt are nothing in compariſon thereof. The Second, That the Council of *Trent* was aſſembled expreſly to reform all Abuſes; ſo that, it is judged to have authorized all thoſe, which he hath not touched.

The other Reflexion that I was willing to make, it's upon that ſaying of my Lord of *Condom*, [*That the Council of* Trent *contents it ſelf to teach the Faithful, that this practice of invoking Saints is good and uſeful, without ſaying any thing more.*] Men underſtand well what that ſignifies. Other Authors have expreſſed it more clearly, and have ſaid, [*We make Profeſſion to believe, that it's uſeleſs to invoke the Saints. But we teach not as a Chriſtian Verity, That all Catholicks are obliged to an actual Exerciſe of this Invocation. For one may be ſaved without it; and may be ſome Catholicks are ſaved, who never invoked any Canonized Saints in Heaven.*] This is one of the great Snares into which our People are caught; they tell them, *If you like not Invocation of Saints, let it alone. One may be ſaved well enough by Invocation of God.*

Expoſ. p. 45.

Henry Holden, de reſolut. fidei, lib. 2. cap. 7.

Firſt,

Firſt, I ſay to that, How can one enter into a Church, wherein Saints are invoked in the Publick Service, without invoking them? One muſt firſt have retrench'd the *Litanies*, *Hymns*, and one half of the acts of the Publick Devotion. One muſt either deprive himſelf of the Publick Service or partake of the Invocation of Saints. That might have been ſaid, if Saints were only invok'd in private. That is then a pure Illuſion. Moreover do they conceive, that it's but diſowning the Worſhip in the Secret of one's Heart, for to have no ſhare therein! When a Man is, by choice of a Religion, not willing to take another, he hath a ſhare in all the Devotions that are practiſed, and which he approves not. When the Publick Miniſter prays, it's in the Name of all preſent, and who make Profeſſion external of adhering to the Worſhip perform'd though they ſhould reject it internally. In fine, I would ask thoſe Gentlemen, If Invocation of Saints be not neceſſary, why do they impoſe it on Chriſtians? Why muſt ſo many Faithful Ones be ſcandalized for a Point they can be without? Why, not to be content with what all the World believes to be neceſſary, *viz.* Invocation of God, without adding that which at leaſt is Superfluous?

ARTICLE VI.

Of Images and Relicks.

WE paſs to *Images*, which is the Fifth of my Lord of *Condom's* Articles. It is a Chapter whereon no fewer things were to be ſaid, than upon the preceding. But in truth, one cannot reſolve to ſay over always the ſame things. I will only ſay, That one muſt not treat of it, as of a ſmall buſineſs, nor imagine it to be no obſtacle to Reunion. The Worſhip of Images is a Practiſe of all moſt oppoſite to the Spirit of *Chriſtianiſm*, and the moſt contrary to the dignity of Man. It's to do great wrong to a Man, to oblige him to bumble himſelf before *Wood* and *Stone*, which are ſo far below him. Men ſhould not flatter themſelves: It's the great Scandal of the *Jew*, he hath Images in abhorrence; and when he looks on Chriſtian Religion, on that ſide, he conceives a mortal averſion from it. So we cannot imagine that to be a ſmall Affair, an Article which retards that great Work of the Converſion of the *Jews*, without which the Church will never be perfect. *But*, ſay they, *will Men never conceive, that it's a great Wrong to compare or confound us with Idolatrous Pagans? It's not true, that we confound the* Roman *Church with the Pagans. Pagans adored the Images of wicked Men, and even the Idols of* Demons; *the* Roman *Church ſerves the Images of Saints, and of the Friends of God*, viz. *Apoſtles, Martyrs, Confeſſors.* Thoſe Gentlemen will nevertheleſs permit us to tell them, That they put Pagans in places, wherein they have not been, ſo to put an infinite diſtance between thoſe Pagans and themſelves

themſelves about the Service of Images, and ſuppoſe that Pagans have ador'd their Images as gods. We ſhould have a little better Opinion of Men, who reſembled us ſo much for ordinary uſe of Reaſon. They regarded their Images, but as Pictures and Repreſentations of their gods: If I could here take the leiſure, I would prove it with the cleareſt Evidence poſſible.

My Lord of *Condom* juſtifies his Church about Images, by theſe Words of the Council of *Trent*, [*Which forbid to believe any Divinity or Vertue, for which it ſhould be rever'd, have any Grace demanded thereof, or faſten ones Confidence thereon.*] *Expoſ.* p. 34. *Concil.* Trid. *Seſſ.* 25.

I am ſurprized to ſee, that after this Decree they ſuffer Prayers addreſſed to Images; and that Men ſhould ſay to the Croſs, [*O Croſs, more bright than all the Stars, famous in the World, amiable to all Men, holier than all things; which alone haſt been worthy to bear the Talent of the World, Sweet Wood that beareſt the Nails and the Sweet Weights, ſave this preſent Aſſembly, that comes hither to celebrate thy Praiſes.*] Every one knows the ſolemn Prayer made to the *Croſs* on great Feaſts, particularly at *Eaſter*, in Holy Week. [*God ſave thee, our only Hope, in this time of the Paſſion, augment the Righteouſneſs of the Faithful, and grant Pardon to the Guilty,*] I know well what they ſay, That theſe Prayers are referr'd to Jeſus Chriſt Crucified. It is not the Senſe of *Thomas Aquinas*, the Prince of the School; for he maintains, That the Worſhip of *Latria* ought to be deferr'd to the *Croſs*, and that Worſhip to be diſtinct from that which is rendred to Jeſus Chriſt. He proves it by the Hymn, *O Crux ave* *Breviary of the* Roman *Church by Order of the Council of* Trent, *and* Pius 5. May 3. Sept. 14.

ſpes, &c. he concludes, [*That the Croſs, whereon Chriſt Jeſus hath been Crucified, ought to be worſhip'd with Worſhip of* Latria; *both becauſe of the repreſentation, and that it hath touch'd the Members of Jeſus Chriſt. As for the Images of the Croſs, of whatever matter they be, they muſt be adored with* Latria, *only of the firſt ſort, viz. with a Relative* Latria.] He ſeems to have reaſon; for we cannot conceive how they can have Intention to ſpeak to Jeſus Chriſt ſpeaking to his Croſs, ſeeing they expreſly diſtinguiſh Chriſt from his Croſs; and that they ſay to it, *Arbor decora & fulgida, &c. Thou art a fair and bright Tree, adorn'd with the Kings Purple, choſen out of a precious Stock, to touch his Holy Members.*

Sum. part. 3. q. 35. art. 4.

I find that very good that the Council of *Trent* hath declared, That there is no virtue at all within the Image; but I cannot conceive how, after that, they have left in the *Roman* Pontifical Prayers; which neceſſarily ſuppoſe, that there is a Sanctifying virtue in the Images of the Croſs: For Example, this which the Biſhop utters in bleſſing a new Croſs, [*Take then this Croſs in thy hands, wherewith thou didſt formerly embrace it, and by the Sanctity of that ſanctifie this; as by that, the World hath been purg'd of his Sins: ſo the Souls of thy Servants, that offer thee this Croſs, by its Merit may be preſerv'd from all Sin.*] After this Decree of the Council of *Trent*, I know not why they tolerate the uſe of *Agnus Dei*, whereto they attribute, [*Virtue of preſerving from the Crafts of the Devil, and from the Frauds of the Evil Spirits, to keep from Shipwrack, to put under ſhelter from all Adverſity; to preſerve from the Peſt, from corrupt Air, the Falling-ſickneſs, Storm, Fires.*

Pontif. Roman.

Libro Sacr. Ceremon. tit. de *Agn. Dei.*

Peril

Peril in Childbirth, and from all Iniquity.] I know not why they go in Pilgrimage to an Image of our Lady more than to another. For in fine, If Images have no other uſe than to recall the Memory of the Originals, they are all alike. If the Spirit of the Council of *Trent* was oppoſite to theſe Devotions, why were they not retrench'd?

At the moſt, will they ſay, You cannot accuſe the Church, but of Negligence and Toleration; but you cannot oppoſe to the Council of *Trent* any thing that may be of equal Authority. I oppoſe thereto Books little leſs authorized than it, as the *Pontifical* and *Roman Ceremonial*, made by the Pope's Order, approved and received by all the *Roman* Church; review'd ſeveral times ſince the Council of *Trent*. I oppoſe thereto, the general and conſtant practiſe of all the Biſhops, even of the moſt moderate. There is none of them that would bleſs a Croſs in other Terms, than thoſe which are preſcribed by the Pontifical. I oppoſe thereto, the practice of the whole *Roman* Church; for if there be in *France* and elſewhere, ſome honeſt perſons, who have purer Sentiments, and which are diſingaged from Popular Errours; they make no Number in compariſon of the People of *Italy*, *Spain*, *Germany* and *France* it ſelf, who are in this Practiſe.

My Lord of *Condom*, about this matter, goes farther than one could have believed. He would fain perſwade us, that in the *Roman* Church they do not ſerve Images at all. [*Our Intention is not ſo much to honour the Image, as to honour the Apoſtle or Martyr in preſence of the Image. We uſe Images but to lift up our Spirit towards Heaven.*] That is equivocal, and they ſay, That in Manuſcript Copies of this Work, which have ran through Mens hands long before it was printed, my Lord of *Condom* ſpoke more

ſtrongly; but having ſeen the Succeſs of his Book, and ſeeing himſelf upheld by ſo great Approbation he is return'd thither, he goes freely through, and makes the Author of the *Advertiſement* ſay, [*We ſerve not Images, God forbid, but we ſerve our ſelves of Images to raiſe us up to the Originals.*] Theſe are things that will ſurprize, and which would never have been expected. It's good to obſerve, that the *Advertiſement* was made after the Approbations. One may ſay, with ſome aſſurance, that *Italy* would not have ſuffered this Word to paſs. However it be, my Lord of *Condom* may bleſs himſelf here, that he hath made an Example. He is the firſt that hath dared to write that, and happily, that hath dared to ſay it. At leaſt, I may aſſure never to have read it in any, nor to have heard it from any perſon, though we ſee daily ſome of the moſt moderate Doctors of the *Roman* Church.

Advertiſm. pag. 62.

It's true, that moſt of theſe Gentlemen cannot endure to be accuſed of Adoring Images. Thereupon we tell them; You are then more ſcrupulous than the moſt Catholick Doctors, who ſay, *That all Catholicks are agreed againſt* Iconomacks, *That ſome Worſhip and Adoration is to be rendred to Images, but that there are diverſities of Opinions among them about the manner and nature of that Adoration. That though it be true, That the Image is not to be ador'd, but becauſe of the Original; yet muſt it be adored in it ſelf and properly, without adoring the Original. That the Images of the* Croſs *are to be adored with Adoration of relative* Latria. *That the Image may be ador'd with that Adoration wherewith its*

Veſquez. in 3. Thom. Tom. 1. diſp. 108. cap. 1. *Suarez.* in 3. Thom. T. 1. diſp. 45. & 5. Thom. qu. 25. art. 4. *Bellarm.* l. 4. c. 23.

its Original is ador'd; properly in truth, but by accident; that we regard the Image as conjoyned to the Original, which is ador'd, and that becauſe of that one may adore it by Accident.] Behold already great Names in the Margin, and one might, without *hyperbole*, add an hundred thereto. But we will go on, and ſay, You are more ſcrupulous than the Writers of *Port-Royal*, who are not accuſed to be Superſtitious, nor exceſſively Catholick. They make one of their Devouts ſpeak thus, [*I kept my Bed for ſeven days, ſince that time, except that I roſe thrice a day to go and adore the Crucifix.*] You are more Catholick than the Popes themſelves, and than the Books, whereof they are the Authors. More than the *Roman Pontifical*, which in the Chapter of the Benediction of a new Croſs, ſince that the Biſhop bending his knees before that Croſs, adores it devoutly and kiſſes it. More than the *Miſſal*, which on *Holy Friday* ſaith of the Croſs, *Come and let's worſhip it.* In fine, we add, that this Scruple, of not being willing to uſe this Word of *Adoring*, in ſpeaking of the Service of Images, is a refined way unknown to the Councils, which have eſtabliſh'd this Service; for the Second of *Nice* ſaith clearly, by the Mouth of *Taraſius*, That all thoſe that will reverence Images, and yet refuſe Adoration to them, are accuſed of Hypocriſie by the Holy Father; *viz.* by *Anaſtaſius*, whoſe Teſtimony he was juſt then relating. This Council in groſs, writing to the Emperours *Conſtantine* and *Irene*, ſpeaks thus to them, [*We believe &c. that Men muſt adore and ſalute the venerable Images of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, of the Virgin, pure Mother of God, and alſo of the glorious Angels, and of all the Saints. And if any one be of another Spirit, and queſtions whether Men muſt adore the holy Images, this holy and venerable Coucil doth Anathematize him.*] *Miracle of the Thorn,* pag. 7.

We

We ſee ſome Authors, who being convinced ſufficiently, that ſince 800 or 900 years no queſtion hath been made of uſing this term of *Adoring* to expreſs the Worſhip given to Images, are willing yet to uſe it; but they diſtinguiſh and aſſure us, That they do not worſhip Images as gods. It's that we willingly believe. Happily among the Vulgar are found ſome ſtupid and ſimple Souls, that do not well diſtinguiſh the Worſhip given to the Image from that, which is to be rendred to God: We cannot forbear ſaying, That they who have eſtabliſhed this Service of Images, ſhall anſwer it to God for theſe Miſtakes of the Vulgar. But however, we impute it not to the *Roman* Church, that they worſhip Images as gods: And I know not whether there ever were any People in the World, to whom it may be attributed; for I can hardly believe, that there hath been any Religion brutiſh enough to give Divinity to Images of Wood, Stone, or Mettal.

Theſe are the Colours that Men have hitherto diſſuſed upon this Worſhip, to render it tolerable to us. We ſerve Images by relation to Originals, ſaid they. We well know, that Figures of *Wood*, *Stone*, and *Mettal*, have no Divinity at all, and are in no way worthy to be ſerved: What Service we give them is becauſe of Jeſus Chriſt, the Holy Virgin, and other Saints, which they repreſent. My Lord of *Condom* ſpeaks not thus: *We ſerve not Images*, ſaith he, *God forbid*. You are not then of the Religion of the Second Council of *Nice*, nor of that of the Council of *Trent*, which confirms what was defined by the Decrees of Councils, and particularly of the Second Council of *Nice*, againſt thoſe that oppoſed Images; which ſaith expreſly, *That Men muſt have in the Churches the Images of Jeſus Chriſt, of the Virgin Mother of God, and*

Seſſ. 25.

and of other Saints, and render to them the honour and Veneration due.] Which adds, in ſpeaking of the ſaid Images, *We kiſs them, we ſalute them, we proſtrate our ſelves before them.* All that is not to ſerve Images, if we believe my Lord of *Condom*. We ſee every day before our eyes, that Images are cloath'd anew on Feaſt-days, that ſome are carried in Pomp, that Men proſtrate themſelves before them, that they kiſs them, that they burn to their honour both Incenſe and Torches, that they place them on Altars; and after all that they tell us, with an air of Aſſurance, *We ſerve not Images, God forbid. God be witneſs of the Juſtice of our Complaint, and of the ſincerity of this Juſtification.*

My Lord of *Condom* ſaith but one word of *Relicks*, I will not ſay much more. He may turn this Worſhip of *Relicks* as pleaſes him; but he ſhall never make us reliſh the adoring of *Aſhes, Bones, Linnens, Wood*, and ſuch other things. I would not pretend to be nicely quarrell'd about that word of *Adoring*. I uſe it in the ſame ſenſe that the Gentlemen of *Port-Royal*, who are exact enough in the choice of Terms. They ſay, in juſtifying the Religious Nuns, *That my Lord Biſhop of* Toul *hath thought good they ſhould follow the Devotion of the People, and of many Perſons of Condition, which came, and are ſtill coming to adore this Holy Thorn.* They relate of a Religious of *Maiſon Dieu* at *Vernon*, That ſhe would be carried to *Port-Royal* to adore that *Holy Thorn*. And of one Madam *Durand*, That ſhe was cured of a Vomiting, which had troubled her for Two years Ten months, after having adored and kiſſed the *Holy Thorn*. They conclude at laſt, *It ſuffices*

Expoſ. p. 39.

Anſwer to a Writing about *Holy Thorn*, p. 7.

Pag. 14.

Pag. 15.

ſuffices to ſay, That if God did not make his help to be felt or hoped, there are no Human
Pag. 18. *Conſiderations that could carry ſo many Perſons to come to the Towns end, to adore this* Holy Thorn *in the Church of* Port Royal. *I dare aſſure, that no man dare deny, that they ſhould adore that Relick which is called, the* Wood of the true Croſs. *Yea, I know none to have condemned* Thomas Aquinas, *who would have the true Croſs to be adored with* Latria. Indeed, we know not how elſe to call the Action of a Perſon, that proſtrates himſelf, that kneels and kiſſes a Relick with Religious Devotion. We conceive not how my Lord of *Condom* can imagine, that God takes well what is done when they lift up the *Chaſſe* of a Saint, where we ſee a dreadful Concourſe of People, which do humble and proſtrate themſelves. Though Men ſay, that this Worſhip hath its Source in God himſelf, and returns thither. That which hath not been commanded by God, hath not its Source in God; and what God diſowns returns not to him.

Here, as in the matter of *Invocation of Saints*, they lay a Snare for them which incline to change of Religion. They tell him, *Well then, If the Worſhip of* Images *and* Relicks *diſpleaſe you, let it alone. No body ſhall force you to it, and you may well enough be ſaved without that Worſhip.* But I conjure them to remember what we have ſaid. Men will not be acquitted, if leaving a good Religion, and entring into a bad one, they only can ſay, *I will hold me to that which the bad Religion hath of Good, and will leave what is not good.* Men ſhall anſwer before God for all the faults of the Church whereinto they have caſt themſelves, and beſides, the Crime of having partak'd of a falſe Worſhip, ſuch ſhall be guilty of the Crime of *Hypocriſie.*

ARTI-

ARTICLE VII.

Of Juſtification and Merit of Works.

MY Lord of *Condom* paſſes to the matter of *Juſtification* and of the *Merit of Works*. He pretends to draw a great Advantage from that, that this Diſpute is not now ſo heated as it was heretofore. He ſuppoſes it to have been a chief Cauſe of our Separation. He adds, That our Learned Men conteſt not now ſo much upon this Matter, as they did formerly; and that this important difficulty of Juſtification is no more conſidered as Capital. Thence he concludes firſt, That our Separation was raſh. Secondly, That we ought to return to that Church out of which we came forth, becauſe of a Doctrine whereof we at this day acknowledge the Innocency: That is it which theſe Words ſignifie. [*We muſt alſo confeſs, That the Learned of their Side do no more conteſt ſo much upon that matter, as they did at the beginning; and there are but few but will confeſs, that they needed not have ſeparated for that Point. But if this important difficulty of* Juſtification, *whereof their firſt Authors made their Fort, is not now any more conſidered as Capital by thoſe who are moſt Judicious among them: We leave them to think what muſt be judged of their Separation, and what might be hoped for towards Peace, if they did but get above Preoccupation, and would but leave the Spirit of Diſputes.*] This is a reflexion which infinitely pleaſes thoſe Gentlemen, they often repeat it. The Writers of *Port Royal* have employed it in their Book of *Prejudices*; and Monſieur *Arnaud* makes a great Work of it in his Book he hath made againſt our *Morals.*

rals. As thoſe two Books have been anſwer'd with ſufficient exactneſs, this Point was not then forgotten. Yet ſeeing thoſe Gentlemen think good to repeat often their Objections to us, they muſt ſuffer us to let them ſee our Anſwers alſo. Behold then the Reflexions which we oppoſe to them of my Lord of *Condom.*

1. It's not altogether true, that the difficulty of *Juſtification* hath been the Fort of our Reformers. It was not there they began. One may read a Bull of *Leo* the Tenth, after the Year 1520, againſt *Luther.* That was the firſt declaration of War, and it's thence that one may compute the beginning of our Separation. That Bull condemns 35 Articles of *Luther's* Doctrine, there is none of them that directly concerns *Juſtification.* In Conſcience, though we were agreed about that matter, would it be a great advance towards Reunion? What would be done with *Worſhip of Saints, Service of Images, Adoration of the Euchariſt*, the *Sacrifice of the Maſs*, and an hundred other things? People do little underſtand matters of Juſtification and of Grace. And what is not popular, is not to the People a cauſe of Separation, and can neither be for them a way of Reunion, though it were agreed on. It would be unhandſom enough and ſtrange, if we ſhould go and tell our People; The Doctrine of the *Roman* Church is much more pure about Grace and Juſtification, than it was formerly; make no more queſtion hence forward to proſtrate your ſelves before Images, invoke Creatures, ſerve the Saints, believe that the Body of Chriſt is in the Bread of the *Euchariſt*, to adore that Bread as God, and to preſent every day the Body of Chriſt in Sacrifice.

2. I agree nevertheleſs, That our Reformers have made of the Errours of the *Roman* Church about *Juſtification*, a Capital Affair; and I maintain, that they had reaſon for it, in the State wherein they found the Doctrine of the *Roman*

Roman Church about this Point. One may ſee, without Exaggeration, that the *Roman* School, before the Council of *Trent*, was *Pelagian*. She taught, [*That Man, without the help of Grace can prepare himſelf to Juſtification by Works truly good; that Man by the ſtrength of Nature, may have a ſerious and a true grief for his Sins, by a Principle of Love, which loves God better than all things elſe, and that this is the laſt and next diſpoſition to Grace habitual Juſtifying; that it is a true Merit, not indeed of Condignity, but of Congruity; and that this Contrition coming after to receive its form, by the reception of habitual Grace becomes Merit of Condignity for the Kingdom of Heaven.*] So *Vaſquez* explains this Senſe, and attributes it to *Scoto*, to *Gabriel Biel*, and *Cajetan*, that is to ſay, to the Princes of the School. *Eſtius* attributes it alſo to *William* of *Auxer*, *Durandus*, St. *Portien*, *Thomas d'Argentine* and *Almainus*. It cannot be denied, but that the *Franciſcans* defended this Opinion in the Council of *Trent* with the utmoſt Ardor. In Conſcience, had not they reaſon to riſe againſt ſuch a Sentiment? *Lewis* of *Catanea*, and the *Dominicans* of his ſide, who maintain'd the Doctrine of *Grace*, according to St. *Auguſtine*, in the ſaid Council, did they not ſay, That they were not able enough to diſtinguiſh that Theology from that of *Pelagius*? Thoſe very Perſons, did they not alſo go further; did they not teach, That Man can do without Grace, and by the force of Nature, all that he doth by the ſuccour of Grace? *Viz.* That he can love God more than all things elſe; to have a true Grief for offending God, not only of Attrition, by the fear of Pain; but of Contrition, by a chaſte Fear, and by a Principle of Love? To obey all Evangelical Commands, believe truly, to be filled with Charity, and

Vaſquez. in Tom. 1. diſp. 91. cap. 20.

upheld

upheld by Hope? This was the Senſe of *Gabriel Biel*, *Occam*, *Cajetan*, *Dominicus à Soto*, who was in the Council of *Trent*; theſe are not Imputations. *Molina* juſtifies himſelf in his Book *de Concordia liberi arbitrii cum Gratiæ donis*, in citing all theſe Authors for himſelf. Is there any thing more *Pelagian*, more oppoſed to the Doctrine of St. *Auguſtine*, who ſuppoſes and proves ſo often, That the beſt of Mens Actions, done without Grace, are but illuſtrious Sins? Though it were true to day, that the *Roman* Church were return'd from that, were there any right to accuſe our Reformers for calumniating her? And could they ſay, That all our Reformation is founded on Calumny? Were they bound to have a Spirit of Prophecy, and to foreſee, that the School of *Thomas*, which then did not make any figure in the World, would reform it ſelf, would reſume ſome force, and would labour to re-eſtabliſh part of the Doctrine of St. *Auguſtine* about Grace?

But I add, That we have not the like cauſe to be content with the Council of *Trent*, about the Doctrine of *Juſtification*, as they would perſwade us. Why hath it kept meaſures with *Pelagian* Opinions? Why did they not condem them? And why did they affect an Ambiguity, through which they ſave themſelves that renew *Pelagianiſm*? By that Ambiguity of the Canons of the Council of *Trent*, the Author

Pag. 85. of the *Advertiſement* would ſatisfie us in a word; [*It's true*, ſaith he, *there are ſome Matters which the Council would not decide, and they were ſuch whereof the Tradition was not conſtant, and whereof they diſputed in the Schools.*] What, the Matters of Grace againſt *Pelagians* were then but vain Diſputes of the School, about which it was not prudent to pronounce? Had it not been defined in the Second Council of *Orange*, that it's a Gift of God, when

when we have good Thoughts, that we turn away our feet from Errour and Injuſtice: That as often as we do good, God acts in us, that we may be able to act: That we cannot prevent Grace by any Merit; and that the good Works that are done without Grace merit not any recompence: That the Grace which is not due to us, prevents us, that we may do good Works. That it is the Gift of God to love him: That he gives us to Love, becauſe he loves us before we love him: That of our ſelves we have nothing but Sin and Lie. That God doth in Man many good things without Man; but that Man doth no good, but what God makes him to do. That the Vertue of Pagans was a worldly Cupidity, but that of Chriſtians is the Charity of God, which is ſhed abroad in our hearts, not by the force of Free Will, which is in us; but by the Holy Ghoſt, which is given us.——— *Concil. Arauſic. An. 529. Can. 9.* *Can. 18.* *Can. 20.* *Can. 17.*

There can nothing be more oppoſite to the Opinions of the School of *Scotus*, who teaches, That Man, of himſelf, may do all kind of good, keep all the Commands in their ſubſtance, love God above all, do Acts of Contrition, of true Faith, true Hope, and thereby prepare himſelf for *Juſtification* by a Proxime preparation. *Yea*, will they ſay, *but the Council of* Trent *hath condemn'd thoſe lax Opinions which ſmelt of* Pelagianiſm. If they condemned them, why are they yet alive in the *Roman* Church? It's an important Point, and that muſt be proved. The School of *Scotus*, of *Molina*, and the *Moliniſts*, carries it by far, and hath ſtill carried it, ſince the Council of *Trent*, againſt the School of *Thomas* and the new *Thomiſts*. This School of *Molina* teaches formally, That all the Acts of Faith, of Love, of Repentance, of Hope, which are neceſſary

neceſſary for the *Juſtification* of an adult Infidel, may be produced as to the Subſtance of the Work, by a Man, in the ſtate of Nature corrupt, with the only forces of Free Will. That Divine Myſteries are indeed ſo high, that a Man without Revelation could not find them out; but when they are reveal'd to him in a convenient manner, without any other Grace, than an external Revelation and the Command of God to believe, he may do Acts of true Faith, and receive thoſe Myſteries with full certitude. This School ſaith the ſame of *Contrition*, of *God's Love*, *&c.* and if Men will not believe us, let them believe *Molina* himſelf. Since the Council of *Trent* have they not maintained, Preparations for Grace by the forces of Nature only, with as much violence as before. *Eſtius* teacheth us, that *Alphonſus à Caſtro* doth teach, That Man by the force of Nature and Free Will, in doing that which is in him for obſervation of Nature's Law, in the ſame Moment receives the Grace of God; becauſe that Divine Bounty ſuffers not, that a Man that lives Morally well, be deprived for a Moment of that Grace, which may render him worthy of Eternal life, though he be not inſtructed in the Faith of Chriſt, and do not yet put his hope in him. We learn from the ſame *Eſtius*, that *Dominicus à Soto*, who was preſent at the Council of *Trent*, and made there ſo much ſtir in the Diſputes about Grace. *Melchior*, *Canus*, *Franciſcus à Victoria*, and many ohers, do maintain Preparations for Grace under another form, and ſay, That *Attrition*, which may be had by the only ſtrength of Nature, is ſufficient, with the Sacrament, to obtain the Grace of *Juſtification*. *Vaſquez* is our Witneſs, that *Ricard*, *Antony*

Concord. lib. Arbitr. *diſp.*7, 8. 13,14.

Eſtius *in* Sent. *lib.*2. *diſt.* 26. *par.* 35. Alphonſ. à Caſtr. *de leg. Pen. lib.*2. *ca.*14.

Antony of *Pantuſe*, and many others have held, ſince the Council of *Trent*, That one may by the force of Nature, obtain the Succour which is needful to pepare ones ſelf immediately to the Grace of *Juſtification*. *Ricardus Tapperus* and *John Driedo*, Profeſſours in the Univerſity of *Lovain*, have taught, That God fails not to come to him that makes a good uſe of his Natural ſtrength, by the practiſe of ſome Works morally good; and that he gives him the Succour of his Grace for to diſpoſe him to the remiſſion of Sins. All that is formally contrary to the Deciſions of the Church againſt the *Pelagians*. Yet all theſe *Theologues* have pretended to follow the Senſe of the Council of *Trent*. I demand then of theſe Gentlemen, who aſſure us, that the Canons of this Council have no ambiguity, whence comes this diverſity of Senſes? If the Canons of the Council are not ambiguous, why do they ſuffer Perſons, who teach *Pelagian* Errours condemned by Canons clear and preciſe? How can it be, that *Alphonſus à Caſtro*, who is ſuch a Catholick, ſhould maintain *Semi-Pelagianiſme* pure with ſuch a violence, that he accuſes the contrary to his of Impurity and Hereſie. If it be true that this contrary Opinion be that of the Council of *Trent*. *Dominicus à Soto* was preſent at the Council, he knew their Spirit, and ſhould have known it; yet, from the time of the Council of *Trent*, he put to light a Book *Natura & Gratia*, wherein he maintains by the Canons of the Council all his *Semi-Pelagian* Opinions. At the ſame time, *Andrew Vega*, a *Franciſcan*, and *Ambroſe Catharin*, Biſhop of *Minori*, made other Books, whereby they found therein Opinions quite contrary. And *Catharin* alſo found in the Deciſions of the Council, the Opinion which he had defended in the Congregations; that is, That Man may be aſſured of himſelf that he is in Grace. One cannot avoid it, as pretends the Author of the *Advertiſement*, in accuſing

the

the fair dealing of *Fr. Paolo*, who hath written the Hiſtory of this Council. For the Works of *Soto*, of *Vega*, and of *Catharin*, do ſubſiſt at this day. And though ſome of them were no more to be found, it would be no leſs true, that they have been.

But do we need other Proofs, to prove the Ambiguity of the Canons of the Council of *Trent*, than the Canons themſelves? The Author of the *Advertiſement*, reproaches *Anonymus*, who hath Anſwer'd my L. of *Condom*, That he could not cite any one Canon of this Council, that is Ambiguous. In Truth, I know not whether there be any that is not ambiguous in this matter of *Juſtification*, except thoſe which condemn the *Lutherans*. The firſt and ſecond of theſe Canons ſay, [*That beſides the Forces of Human Nature and the Doctrine of the Law, Grace is neceſſary to Man to be juſtified, and for to deſerve Eternal life.*] Would not *Semi-Pelagians* have ſigned theſe Canons? And will that hinder at this day Thouſands of People from teaching with the *Semi-Pelagians*, That Grace is not efficacious of it ſelf, but by the Liberty of Man; that it is not Grace that determines Man at Converſion; that God gives every Man a certain ſufficient Grace, whereof the good and ill uſage do abſolutely depend on the Will of Man? So that it is Man that diſtinguiſhes himſelf, and not Grace that diſtinguiſhes Man, contrary to what St. *Paul* ſaith ſo preciſely, *Who is he that puts a diſtinction between thee and another? What haſt thou, that thou haſt not received?*

The Third Canon ſaith, [*That without the Inſpiration of the Holy Ghoſt and his Succours, a Man cannot Believe, Love or Repent, to obtain the Grace of Juſtification.*] That is good, but what need was there to thruſt in a *Sicut oportet*; Man cannot Believe, Hope and Love (as is needful) to receive the Grace of *Juſtification*. By the favour of this bad Word, the School

of

of *Molina* maintains its *Pelagianiſm*, That without the Grace and the Succour of the Holy Ghoſt a Man may believe, and do true acts of Faith, of Hope, of Contrition, and love God more than all things elſe. And when it is preſſed with the Canon of the Council of *Trent*, ſhe ſaves her ſelf by the *Sicut oportet*. She ſaith, the Canon ſaith not abſolutely, That without Grace Man cannot do true Acts of Faith, of Love, and of Contrition; but it ſaith, That he cannot do them in that manner that is needful; that is to ſay, That thoſe Acts of Contrition and of Love, which are done without Grace, are not ſufficient for *Juſtification*; there muſt intervene ſome others, or that habitual Grace and that of the Sacrament be diffuſed upon thoſe. They that uphold the Doctrine of St. *Auguſtine* ſay to the contrary, that the Senſe of the Council of *Trent* is, That Man cannot do in any manner thoſe Acts of Love and Contrition without preventing Grace. Why did not the Council declare it ſelf about that? Methinks the Affair is important enough; for the queſtion is no leſs than for the eſtabliſhing *Pelagianiſm*, or for the deſtruction thereof. The Council of *Trent*, will they ſay, hath followed preciſely the Sixth Canon of the Second Council of *Orenge*, where the *Sicut oportet* is alſo found. So the Canon of the Council of *Trent* is no more ambiguous, than that of the Council of *Orenge*. It's true, but the difference is, That the Ambiguity of the Canon of the Council of *Orenge* is innocent, and that of the Council of *Trent* is affected. The Council of *Orenge* could not foreſee, that Men would abuſe this Term, as they have done; but the Council of *Trent* could not be ignorant, that they would abuſe it, and put it in expreſsly, that they might not condemn the School of *Thomas*, nor that of *Scotus*, ſeeing they ſaw that the Scholaſticks had abuſed that Word, which had ſlipt in innocently into the deciſions of the

the Church, they were not excuſable in putting it in again into a new Canon to give place to the ſame Abuſes.

The Fifth Canon, which ſaith, [*That Free Will, after the Sin of* Adam, *is neither loſt nor quenched, or extinct, can have a good Senſe; for we know well, that by Sin Men are not become Marbles and Stones, Stocks and Stumps.*] But who ſees not, that this may be explained in favour of thoſe who maintain, That Man in the ſtate of Corruption may fulfil God's Law perfectly, and do Works that are truly good? A Doctrine abſolutely *Pelagian*, condemned by the Council of *Orenge*, which declares, That the Vertues of Pagans is but *Cupidity* and *Self-love*. A Doctrine oppoſed to that Maxim of St. *Auguſtine*, *Homo male utens libero Arbitrio perdidit ſe & liberum Arbitrium, &c. Ita cum libero peccaretur Arbitrio, victore peccato, amiſſum eſt & liberum Arbitrium.* Man in making ill uſe of his Free Will, hath been loſt, and his Free Will alſo; In his ſinning freely Sin is become Victor, and Free Will was loſt; that is to ſay, that he is ſo deliberated, that without the help of God, he can no more turn to the ſide of Good, neither of the good Moral, nor of the good Supernatural.

Enchirid. cap. 30.

The Seventh Canon orders, *That all the Works which are done before Juſtification, in whatſoever manner they are done, are not truly Sins, and do not merit the hatred of God.* That is true, if by theſe Actions, which precede Juſtification, they underſtand Acts of Repentance and of Faith, which ought to precede Pardon of Sins, and which are done by the Succours of the Holy Ghoſt, and of preventing Grace. But it is not clear that this Canon doth favour thoſe that ſay, *That the Works of the Infidels done without Grace, may be good Works, and that their Vertues were true Vertues.*

A

A Doctrine as *Pelagian*, as any that can be ſo. By thoſe Works which precede Juſtification, it is as eaſie to underſtand the Works done without Grace, as thoſe that are done by preventing Grace. I do not here make an *Examen* of the Council of *Trent*, therefore will I not advance further this Chapter of Ambiguities. It's not the hundred part of Obſervations of this Nature, which might be made, and upon the Sixth Seſſion, where the Matter of Grace is treated, and upon all other Seſſions. This would be nevertheleſs enough to let Men ſee, that we have no reaſon to be ſatisfied with the Council of *Trent*, about the Manner, wherewith they have explained *Juſtification*.

4. But it is not the only Ambiguity of his Canons, which gives us a juſt ſubject of Complaint, and will afford us a lawful reaſon to refuſe eternally the ſubſcription of thoſe Canons, which they have made about *Juſtification*. It is for Example, the odious Term which they give unto Doctrines the moſt innocent in the World.

The Seventh Canon is made, to perſwade, *That we look upon as very Sins the motions of Faith and Contrition, that ought to precede Juſtification*. Which is not ſo. The Eighth ſuppoſes that we ſay, *That every fear of Hell is a Sin, and ſerves only to render Sinners more Criminal*; which is far diſtant from our Sentiments. The *9th*, the *19th*, the *21th* and the *27th*, condemn us, as if we did teach, *That for to be Juſtified we need only to have a naked Faith, ſimple and deſtitute of the ſociety of good Works*: A Doctrine which we moſt abhor. The *10th* and the following, have given place to thoſe Tragical Declamations against *Imputed Righteouſneſs*, whereof theſe Gentlemen acknowledge this day the Truth and Innocence. *So the Juſtice of Jeſus Chriſt is not only imputed, but actually communicated*

Expoſ. p. 49.

to his Faithful Ones, by the operation of the Holy Ghoſt, ſaith my Lord of *Condom.* The 13*th* and 14*th* impute an abſurd Doctrine to us. *That for obtaining remiſſion of Sins and Juſtification, we muſt believe that we have already received it.*

5. Behold yet another Reaſon of our refuſal to Subſcribe the Decrees of this Council about *Juſtification.* It is, becauſe it condemns for Hereſies thoſe Opinions which we believe to be ſound and true. The 12*th* Canon, the 15*th* and 16*th*, in giving an odious and little faithful Turn to our Doctrine, upon the Certainty that we may have, that we are in Grace, and that we are Predeſtinate, would ſnatch away from us a Truth, which we believe to be of abſolute neceſſity for the tranquillity of the faithful Soul. It's Confidence in God and in his Promiſes, which renders us certain of our Salvation for ſo long a time as we are in actual obedience to his Commands. The Canon 17*th* and 23*th*, which impute unto us, to believe, *That Men are Predeſtinated to Evil,* which we do abhor, would at the ſame time take away from us a Truth clearly couched in the Word of God and which hath been acknowledg'd by St. *Auguſtine.* It is, *That God calls no others, but thoſe whom he hath Predeſtinated; and Juſtifies no others, but ſuch as he hath ſo called; and will Glorifie no others, but ſuch as he hath ſo Juſtified:* that is to ſay, That the Grace which God gives the Reprobate, is not a Grace truly Juſtifying, and that Juſtification is never loſt. The Canon 18*th* and 25*th* tend to ruine a very conſiderable Truth, *viz. That in our beſt Works there are ſome defects.* A Sentiment which we account ſo important, that without it, according to us, cannot be preſerved our Chriſtian Humility. And at the ſame time thoſe ſame Canons impute to us to ſay, *That all the good Works of the*

Auguſt. *de Prædeſt.* cap. 17.

the Faithful are mortal Sins; the which we abhor. The 28*th* ſets down a Doctrine which we cannot receive; it is, *That Faith without Charity, and without Works, is a true Faith.*

6. In fine, We cannot ſubſcribe to the Doctrine of this Decree, becauſe that although the Canons thereof were in ſome places capable of receiving a good Senſe in the Theory, yet they give them a very bad one in the Practiſe. For Example, the 18*th* Canon, that ſaith, *That Man can fulfil the Law of God, when he is upheld by his Grace:* And the 38*th*, which expounds in what manner our Works are Merits, might be received with the Gloſſes of Monſieur *de Condom*; but they cannot be ſuffered in that Senſe, which the practiſe of the Vulgar gives them. I maintain, that the Devouts of the *Roman* Church believe to be ſaved by the Merit of their Works, and to gain Paradiſe by their Mortifications, as Men gain a moderate Reward by the greateſt of all Labours. Able Men among the Moderns, do ſpeak of this Matter like my Lord of *Condom*, I grant; but Vulgar Predicators deliver this Doctrine in a moſt ſcandalous manner, and moſt approaching to *Pelagianiſme*. The Canons of the Council may receive this popular Senſe, which they give it in their Practiſe, as well as that, which Able Men of the Church of *Rome* give thereto in their Theory. But are we obliged to receive and prefer the Senſe of *Theory*, which doth nothing, and which is ſhut up among a few Perſons, to this Senſe of *Practiſe*, which is diffuſed through the World? Why have Men ſo much jealouſie for this Term, *Merit*, which is proud and oppoſite to Chriſtian Humility? Though Men ſtrive much, they will never blot out of it thoſe Idea's of Pride which Uſe hath faſtened thereto. Whilſt it is ſaid to Men, that *their Works merit Eternal life*, they will always perſwade themſelves

ſelves, that thoſe Works are of a great Perfection, and that there is a proportion between what they give to God, and what God renders to them. Though we were different but only in Terms, were it not better to ſpeak with us, ſeeing our ſtyle carries one neceſſarily to Humility; than with ſuch Canons, whoſe Expreſſions do carry one naturally to Pride? Whereupon are founded thoſe proud Opinions, that in ſhutting up themſelves in a Convent; that in making Vows of Celibate, Poverty and Chaſtity; in doing voluntary Mortifications, Men have Righteouſneſs and Merits to ſpare, ſo as to impart to ſuch as have not enough, and that Men can have Works of Supererogation? Whence comes all that, I ſay, but from the Theology of this Council, and of that of its Interpreters?

In a word, to ſhorten, I ſay, there are at leaſt Four Reaſons, for which we cannot yield to the Doctrine of *Juſtification*, in that manner wherein the Council hath explained it.

1. The firſt is, That by its Ambiguities and its uncertain Expreſſions, it hath left *Semi-Pelagianiſme* entirely untouched, and even *Pelagianiſme* it ſelf too. The Second, That it condemns us unjuſtly, attributing to us Opinions which we do not hold at all. The Third, That it condemns ſuch Truths, which we may not, and ought not to forſake. The Fourth, That its Expreſſions do conduce naturally to the Senſe which we give it and do oppoſe, as appears by the Practiſe of the People, and of its Devouts, and by the Books of the Demi-Doctors of the *Roman* Church. My Lord of *Condom* may ſee preſently, that without caſting our ſelves upon Queſtions of Subtilty, as he ſpeaks, there are yet many things that ſeparate us from him about the Article of *Juſtification*.

Expoſ. p. 61.

ARTI-

ARTICLE VIII.

Of Satisfactions, Indulgences, and Purgatory.

MY Lord of *Condom* hath reaſon to treat of *Indulgences* and *Satisfactions* after Juſtification; for Indulgences are the Juſtifications of Men, and Juſtification is the Indulgence of God. But he muſt permit me to tell him, that he hath no reaſon to treat this Affair as a Controverſie of Nothing, and that ſhould not ſeparate us from the *Roman* Church. They ſay that Catholicks teach, with a common accord, *That only Jeſus Chriſt, God and Man together, was capable, by the infinite Dignity of his Perſon, to offer to God a ſufficient Satisfaction for our Sins; but that He applies to us that infinite Satisfaction in two manners; either in giving us an intire Abſolution, without reſerving any Pains, which he doth in Baptiſm; or elſe in commuting that Eternal pain into Temporal pains; Pains whereof the Church remains Miſtreſs, and when that is relaxed, that is called* Indulgence. Thence muſt we not conclude, ſay they, [*Neither that Jeſus Chriſt did not intirely ſatisfie for us; nor that we ſatisfie for our ſelves, for ſome part of the Pain which is due to our Sins; ſeeing that which is called* Satisfaction, *is only, after all this, but the application of the Satisfaction of Jeſus Chriſt.*] After this the Author of the *Advertiſement* Advertiſ. cries out, with an air of Confidence, *pag.*44. *What will they ſay now?* If thoſe Gentlemen pleaſe to hear us, they ſhall ſee that we have yet ſomewhat to ſay.

As they have repreſented their Doctrine about this, as they thought good, they will permit us to repreſent it ſuch as it is in effect; and that is it we are going to do, when we ſhall have advertized, That they muſt not here recall us to the Council of *Trent*, as they do upon other Matters, becauſe the Council ſays nothing about this. I ſay, *Nothing*, literally meant. They that have read the Hiſtory of that Council, know that the Prelates and the Theologians, that made it up; the Ambaſſadours of Princes, which had perceived the uſeleſsneſs thereof; the Pope and the Council of *Rome*, who did maintain the Charges of it, and who feared the Deciſions thereof: All thoſe Perſons, I ſay, wearied with the long Continuation of the Council, after they had finiſhed the Matter of Orders, which had held there Ten whole Months? and that of Marriage; which had occupied them four Months more, reſolved to end it at any rate. So that in three Weeks time they ſtrangled all the Buſineſs that remained, which might have kept the Council at work as long as it had laſted already; and one of thoſe Matters was that of *Indulgences*, about which they contented themſelves to Pronounce, [*That the uſe thereof was ſaving; that the diſtribution of them was to be done by the Church; but that the Abuſes thereof were to be retrenched.*] Behold in what manner was terminated in three Words, that which all Chriſtendom had conceived to be one of the greateſt Affairs of the Council; which had been the Scandal of all *Europe*, and the firſt occaſion that cauſed a Banner to be lifted up againſt the *Roman* Church. It's true, that Ten or Twelve years before the 14*th* Seſſion, held under *Julius* the Third, did treat of *Satisfaction* in treating of *Penitence*, but it ſaid nothing of *Indulgences*. So that they muſt give us leave to ſearch out the Opinion of the *Roman* Church, about this Affair, in th_

Practiſe_

Practise and Decisions of Doctours, adding thereto what the Council of *Trent* hath said of *Satisfaction.*

1. They say, That our Sins deserve two sorts of Pain, Eternal Pains and Temporal Pains. 2. They grant, That the Merit of Jesus Christ is infinite, and that, if God would, this Merit could could be applied to nullifie Temporal Pains, as well as Eternal Pains. 3. But they hold, That Jesus Christ would not suffer for to exempt his Elect from Temporal Pains, or at least, that he leaves absolutely to the Church the application of his infinite Satisfaction, with respect to these Temporal Pains. 4. They distinguish the *Guilt* from the *Pain*, and they say, That God forgives all the Guilt, and retains one part of the Pain. [*The Holy Council declares, That it's false and contrary to the Word of God, that the Guilt can never be pardoned, unless all the Pain be remitted.*] Concil. *Trident.* Sess. 14. cap. 8.

5. They say, That the Justice of God requires this Reservation, That the Sins that follow Baptism be punished by Temporal Pain. [*Divine Justice seems to require, That they who have sinned after Baptism be received into Grace; otherwise then those who have sinned through Ignorance, before Baptism.*] Ibid.

6. Behold the Uses which the Council finds in these *Satisfactions.* 1. It's to serve as a Bit and Bridle to Sinners. 2. To drive out the ill Habits by the practice of opposite Vertues. 3. To turn away the Pains which might be sent from God. 4. To render us conformable to Jesus Christ, in that we suffer to satisfie our Sins, as Jesus Christ hath suffered to satisfie for those very Sins. 5. To chasten and punish Sinners for their preceding Sins. Is it not an admirable thing, that the Council among those Reasons have

forgotten none, but that of my Lord of *Condom*, according to whom, [*Satuſactions have no other uſe, but to make application of the Infinite Satisfaction of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt?*] The Council, as well as he, pretends, That theſe Human Satisfactions do no prejudice to the infinite Merit of Jeſus Chriſt. [*But it is becauſe, not being able of our ſelves, or ſufficient to any thing, we receive of Jeſus Chriſt power to ſatisfie, and to bring forth Fruits worthy of Repentance.*] Theſe are the Words of the Council. This Reaſon is not that of Monſieur *de Condom*; and the Council might more briefly have ſaid, if they had been in the ſame Thought, *The Satuſactions which the Church impoſes, do no prejudice to the Merit of Jeſus Chriſt, becauſe they are but Applications of the infinite Merit of our Saviour.*

Expoſ. p. 57.

7. They ſay, That theſe Pains, which remain to be ſuffered after that the Guilt and Eternal Pains have been remitted, are the ſame pain of Senſe, which the Sinners ſhould have ſuffered in Hell, ſtripping it only of its Eternity. 8. They ſay, That this Infernal Pain, being Temporal, may be redeemed by Penal Works, and that thoſe Works are truly and properly Satisfactory. [*In following the Senſe of the whole Church, we will labour to prove, That by the Penal Works, whereof we have ſpoken, Men ſatisfie truly and properly to God for the Pain which remains to be paid, after that the Guilt is remitted.*] 9. They ſay, That the Church is Miſtreſs of theſe Satisfactory Pains, and that ſhe hath the Right of impoſing or relaxing them; and they are theſe Relaxations of Pains which they call *Indulgences*. 10. [*That there is a Treaſure of theſe* Indulgences, *made*

Bellarm. lib. 4. *de Pœnitent.* cap. 1. 55.

Bellarm. ibid. c. 7. 55.

made up of the Satisfactions *of Jeſus Chriſt, and of thoſe of the Saints, which may be applied to them that are obliged to bear the Pain of their Sins, after that the Guilt hath been remitted to them by the Sacrament of Penitence.*] 11. [*That there is in all good Works of the Juſt a double reſpect, the one of* Merit, *the other of* Satisfaction; *That that of* Merit *cannot be applied to another, becauſe God rewards Works beyond their Merits; but that of* Satisfaction *may be applied to other.*] And that, becauſe a Man may do of thoſe painful Works much more than he hath need of, or may ſuffer by the Providence, Diſpenſation, or by the Perſecution of Men, thoſe Temporal Pains, which go far beyond what is neceſſary for the ſatisfaction of his own Sins, which happened to the Bleſſed Virgin, which having committed no Sins, hath ſuffered ſo many Pains; and to the Bleſſed Prophets, Apoſtles and Martyrs, whoſe life having been moſt holy, hath yet been a continual Series of Croſſes, voluntary and involuntary. 12. So in that Treaſure of the Church, with the Merits of Jeſus Chriſt, are the Sufferings of the Bleſſed Virgin, and of all the Saints, which have ſuffered more than their Sins required. 13. By theſe ſuperabundant Satisfactions of Jeſus Chriſt, and of the Saints, may be applied to others, by the Paſtors of the Church, both by way of Indulgences and by the Sacraments, with this difference, *That the Satisfaction of Jeſus Chriſt may be applied both by the Sacrament and by the Indulgences; but the Satisfactions of Saints cannot be applied, but by way of Indulgences.* 14. That the Pope is he, in whom principally reſides the Power of diſtributing theſe Indulgences; therefore he may grant to the Faithful plenary Indulgences. 15. That

Bellarm. *lib.* 1. de Indulg. *cap.* 2. 45.

Bellarm. *ib.*

Bellarm. ib. c. 2. Prop. 4.

the Treaſure of theſe *Indulgences* is opened by the Pope, not only in favour of the Living, but alſo of thoſe that are in Purgatory, for whom the Pope applies out of this Treaſure as much as is needful, to recompence the Pain which they ſhould pay in Purgatory. 16. For Diſtribution of *Indulgences*, the *Roman* Church hath eſtabliſhed what ſhe calls *Jubilees*; they are priviledged Years, wherein they grant Plenary Indulgences both of Guilt and Pain to them all, who being contrite and confeſſed, ſhall do certain Works impoſed on them. *Boniface* the 8*th*, firſt Author of theſe *Jubilees*, about the Year 1300. Ordained that they ſhould return every Hundred year. About 45 after, *Clement* the 6*th* Ordained, that they ſhould be celebrated from 50 to 50 Years. *Urban* the 6*th* would have them put to 33 Years, and publiſhed a *Bull* about it. But *Paul* the Second, Sitting in 1464. Ordered them to 25 Years. It is good to remark, by the by, the great Antiquity of theſe *Jubilees*, that they may not reproach us to have loaded our Diſcourſe with an uſeleſs Chronology. 17. Of theſe *Indulgences*, ſome are for 1000, 10000, 150000; there are ſome for Sins paſt and Sins to come. To the *Auguſtines* of *Padua*, they grant a plenary Indulgence for all Sins committed after Baptiſm till the laſt Confeſſion, with 18000 Years for the future. 18. Theſe *Indulgences* are fixed to certain Churches and Priviledged Altars and thoſe Priviledges laſt no longer than the Stones and Edifices; for if they be ruined, the *Indulgences* periſh alſo. 19. They obtain theſe *Indulgences* by the Viſits of certain Churches; of thoſe of St. *Peter* and St. *Paul*, of St. *Mary Major*, and of St. *John* of *Lateran*, at *Rome*. Every Saint rewards his Devouts at the Conceſſion of theſe Indulgences. At *Rome*, *St. Coſme* and St. *Damian* furniſh a Thouſand Years Indulgences; *Euſebius*, 7454 Quarentines; St.

Praxade,

Praxade, 1200; St.*Bibiane*, 600000. 20. In fine, Theſe *Indulgences* are gotten by repeating many times *Ave Maria*, bearing bleſſed Grains, Roſaries, Meddals, St.*Francis*'s Cord, Scapularies, Holy Girdles, Kiſſing Relicks, and Praying to Saints.

We muſt not oppoſe thereto the *Bull* publiſhed 1678. againſt *Indulgences* by Order of *Innocent* the 11*th*, now Sitting. For beſide that, that Piece hath ſcandalized all the *Roman* Church, which we very well know, it aboliſhos only Falſe Indulgences. Theſe are the Terms of the *Bull*: It's meant of *Indulgences* wholly falſe and ſuppoſititious, which are carried and publiſhed in divers parts of the World. For the reſt, the *Bull* confirms what it doth not condemn, and for one that it aboliſhes, it leaves without *hyperbole* more than a Thouſand. Behold a ſincere deſcription both of the Doctrine and Practiſe of the *Roman* Churches about *Satisfactions* and *Indulgences*.

Monſieur of *Condom* would have us to count that for Nothing. It is then nothing that Men ſhould be permitted to conceive this proud Opinion, that they can give Satisfaction to God, *Verè & propriè*, truly and properly. It is nothing to advance that Maxim ſo contrary to Humility, ſo far as to ſay, That they ſatisfie to God beyond what they ought, and lend to thoſe that have not Merit enough, out of their own Overplus. It is that whereof we may ſee divers remarkable and new Examples in the Second Anſwer of *Anonymus* to Monſieur of *Condom*. It's nothing to make a Treaſure, ſtor'd in ſuch a ſurprizing manner, with the Merits of Chriſt and of Men. What Union can there be between the Finite and Infinite? Can Men conceive, that this can be no prejudice to Jeſus Chriſt? It is nothing, to make the Saints enter into their part of that Benefit, which delivers Men from a Pain, though not Eternal, yet altogether like that of Hell. How

can

can Men ſay, that theſe Human Satisfactions and Indulgences are nothing, after all, but the application of the infinite Merit of Jeſus Chriſt? Had Men need, if it were ſo, of the Merits and ſuperabundant Sufferings of the Saints, to make application of the Satisfaction of Jeſus Chriſt? It is nothing of giving to the Pope power of diſpenſing the Merits of Jeſus Chriſt to whom he pleaſes. It is nothing, to put into his hands the Key of thoſe places, where the Dead ſuffer, to draw thence whom he pleaſes, in paying for them thoſe Richeſſes drawn out of his Treaſures, and ſo to carry on his Power to the very Empire of death it ſelf. It is nothing that they eſtrange and draw off the Spirits and Hearts of Men from the practice of the true Means, which God hath appointed for Application of the Merit of Jeſus Chriſt, *viz.* Sacraments and Contrition of Heart; to give them up to ſuch Means, whereof Scripture ſaith not a word; as the *Viſitation of certain Churches*, *Invocations of certain Saints*, *Scapularies* and *Relicks*. We muſt count it for Nothing, to fill the Capacity of the Spirit and Heart of the Vulgar, which is but narrow, with ſo many Trifles and things of Nought, which is the cauſe that there remains no more room for Acts of true Devotion. It is nothing, that they diſhonour Chriſtian Religion by a confuſed heap of Practiſes, which are unworthy the Greatneſs of his Majeſty, and of his Spiritualneſs; that they carry out the Piety of the Faithful to be diffuſed upon *Roſaries*, *Chapelets*, *Scapularies*, *Cords*, *Girdles*, *Relicks*, *Aſhes*, *Churches*, *Stones*, *Altars*, *Images*, to obtain thereby Remiſſion of Sins, which they ſhould receive from God immediately, and him alone. Theſe *Indulgences* are nothing, which have given place to ſo many Abuſes, ſo many Simonies, whereby they have ſold the moſt Holy things, and made a Trade of the Remiſſion of Sins. It is they which have given birth to

thoſe Scandalous Books, like to that of the *Roman Chancery*, where every Sin is taxed at a certain Rate. Yet it is the Court of *Rome* that had made them, they were the *Indulgences* which had given place to them.

There is nothing in this moſt horrid relaxation of the Diſcipline of the Church. Heretofore, ſhe did Ordain for the chaſtiſement of Scandalous ſins, Ten years, Twenty years, and Thirty years of Penitence. The Fear of being ſo long ſeparate from the uſe of Holy things was a Bridle, that reſtrained them from the violence of Paſſions. Theſe long Pennances were done in Publick, and the dread of making Crimes ſo publick was another Bank, to ſtop the fury of Luſt. At this day, according to the Doctrine of *Indulgences*, a Man that ſhall have committed in one day enormous Crimes enough to ſubject to Ten thouſand years of Pennance, ſhall need but to viſit a Church or an Altar priviledged, to be quit thereof. Let him return to his Crimes a while after, he may get out of the ſame Abyſs by the ſame Means. Theſe Gentlemen, that reproach with words of ſo much exceſs the ill Conſequences, which they pleaſe to draw from our Doctrines againſt the Moral of Jeſus Chriſt, would they have us to conſider as innocent a point of Doctrine and of Practice, which pours upon the Moral, and upon all Manners, ſuch Malignant Influences? There are *Indulgences* for five or ſix Hundred Thouſand years, unto 1500000. Few do conceive the meaning thereof; for *Indulgences* are deſigned to deliver Souls out of Purgatory, or to prevent the Pains; now Purgatory is not to laſt 1500000, for it cannot laſt longer than the World. This is the Caſe: The Ancient Church, during the Severity of its Diſcipline, did impoſe for one Sin, Ten, Twenty, or Thirty years of Penitence, according to the Nature of the Crime. For Example: Suppoſe we, that the Canons did impoſe

poſe Ten years of Penitence for a Murther, a Man that ſhould have committed ten Murthers, would be ſubject, according to theſe Canons, to a Hundred years of publick Penitence. He that ſhould have committed an hundred Crimes, *Murthers*, *Adulteries*, and other of this Nature, would be obliged to 1000 years of Penitence. It may happen, that certain Men may have committed Crimes enough to be obliged to many Thouſand years of Pennance. In the place of Years of Pennance, they have put the Years of Indulgences; ſo that every Year of *Indulgence*, delivers from the obligation of a Year of *Pennance*. So they to whom are granted 1500000 years of *Indulgence*, are they which have need of 1500000 years of *Penitence*. It's preſently eaſie to ſee, how terrible the Sequel of ſuch a Theology is, for the Moral. It is to preſuppoſe that a Man can commit, without being a Reprobate, almoſt an infinite number of enormous Crimes. When the Diſcipline of the Church began to relax of this extream Rigour wherein ſhe was at firſt, inſtead of Ten years of Penance and Abſtention, ſhe appointed but two. Suppoſe 1500000 Indulgence and Relaxation for the years of Penitence; at that ſort of account, you ſuppoſe a Man may have committed Seven or Eight hundred Thouſand Mortal Sins; for they impoſe no Pennance for Venial Sins. I grant that this Conſequence frightens me; yet they would have me to account it for nothing.

Before I finiſh this Article, I beſeech thoſe Gentlemen to conceive, that for to know how much a Doctrine doth eſtrange one Religion from another, we muſt not conſider it in that which is Speculative, becauſe the People penetrate but little into the Speculative part of a Doctrine. We muſt behold it, by that which is reduc'd to practice. In ſpeaking of *Satisfactions* and *Indulgences*, Monſieur *Condom* will only conſider

conſider what they have of Speculative, &c. *viz.* the prejudice they can do to Jeſus Chriſt, to his Merit, and to his Satisfaction. If Men will, without prejudice reflect on what we have ſaid, they ſhall ſee we have reaſon to make this Complaint againſt *Indulgences*. But it is not that Conſideration wherewith the People are moſt intangled. Let them then take the pains to behold the Practiſe which follows this Doctrine, and he ſhall ſee, that there is nothing that ſeparates us more from their Church, than theſe *Satisfactions* and *Indulgences*. This is the Spring of that incredible multitude of Ceremonies, of *Corporal Mortifications*, of *Hair Shifts*, *Iron Bonds*, *Cloiſters*, *Monks*, *Vows*, *Pilgrimages*, *Jubilees*, *Stations*, *Church Viſits*, *Prayers for the Dead*, *Maſſes*, *Conſecrated Gifts*, *Fraternities*, *Devotions for certain Saints and Images*; for all that is done either to ſatisfie God, or to obtain *Indulgences*. So that we may ſay in truth, That this Article, which Monſieur *de Condom* reckons almoſt as Nothing, doth between his Church and ours put up a Wall of Separation, which cannot be beaten down, but by the ruine of the one or of the other Party.

Purgatory is naturally tied with *Satisfactions* and *Indulgences*. For Men do not labour to Satisfie during this life, by Penal Works; and Men have recourſe to *Indulgences* then, to avoid the Temporal Pains of the other World; which, omitting Eternity, are altogether like thoſe of Hell. Monſieur *de Condom* ſaith nothing of it, or but a ſhort word by the by. I conceive not the reaſon of that, unleſs he hath judged, that having no other Curtain to draw over this Object ſo frightful and terrible, he ought at leaſt cover himſelf with that of Silence. Yet have we ſtill made a great buſineſs thereof, and had good Reaſon for it. I pray them who are tempted to change their Religion, to bethink themſelves well of what they have

have to do; and not to engage eaſily into one Party that offers them ſome Pleaſures and ſome Advantages in this World; but promiſes them to pay well for it in the other.

Seeing that Monſieur *de Condom* was not willing to plead for *Purgatory*, I will ſpeak a word in its favour. Though all that is taught about it were not true, what hurt can that do, and what Venom is there in that Doctrine, that could hinder Re-union? Can we repreſent too much Terrour to Sinners? And a Penitent, that leaving this life, would think to go to Purgatory, would not he be very glad to meet immediately with Paradiſe? It is a Bit, which may ſerve to reſtrain the fierceneſs of Paſſions, and which after all can do no hurt, though it were a bond of Straw, and an imaginary Object. To that I Anſwer, firſt, That this Bit is indeed an Imaginary Bit, and which produces not any Sanctification. We ſee not, that in the Communion, wherein they teach this Doctrine, there be a leſſer number of Sinners, Worldlings and Wicked men. It is an errour to conceive, that thoſe which cannot be reſtrained by the Fear of Hell, ſhall be ſo by that of *Purgatory*. On the contrary, Luſt finds therein what to flatter it ſelf withal. *Go to*, ſaith it, *Let's refuſe our Senſes nothing, we ſhall be quit for ſome years in Purgatory the longer, and we will not loſe any Pleaſure: We ſhall have all the pleaſures of the Fleſh in the World, and we will obtain thoſe of Heaven, after ſome years of Torment.* We ſay beſides, That there are honeſter ways to retain Men in their Duty. It is certain, that in this the *Roman* Religion hath not the Character of an Evangelical Religion, in that to bring Men to Sanctity, ſhe makes too much uſe of Terrour. The Spirit of the Goſpel is a Spirit of Sweetneſs. The Law of *Moſes* had a hundred Threats for one Promiſe; but the Goſpel hath a hundred Promiſes for one Threatning. Its Character is that

that of *Debonairty*. Mens Souls muſt be drawn by Love, to oblige them to Love God. That is the true Principle of Sanctification. Though it were true, That *Purgatory* were capable of reſtraining Men, God hath no need of a Lie, for his help, to uphold his Truth, and to ſettle his Juſtice. But there is ſomething more, and we are engaged to regard this Controverſie as a Capital Affair, and for many Reaſons.

1. We are obliged to nouriſh the peace of honeſt and pure Conſciences, and of Souls truly penitent. They accuſe us of lulling them aſleep, and plunging them into Security. God is our Witneſs therein. We preſent to them juſt and lawful Terrours, by the ſight of the Pains of Hell; but when they have eſcaped thoſe Pains by a true Repentance, we would account a Cruelty to preſent to them other Pains of the ſame Nature, and declare them to be unavoidable. If the *Roman* Church ſhould teach this *Dogma* in good earneſt, and that it were ſo believed: I maintain, it would be Impoſſible for their Faithful People to die without unimaginable Auguiſhes. A Moment in *Purgatory* is ſomething more cruel than whole Years of the Gout, or Gravel, Colick, and all other Pains gathered together in ſome wretched Creature. How could a Man die with any tranquillity, being aſſured to fall into Torments ſo horrible and of ſo long continuance? If we muſt conſider it as a Capital Crime, to make a poor Wretch ſuffer, without the Magiſtrates Order, Racks and dolourous Torments; We cannot behold it as a light thing to torment Souls ſo cruelly, without God's Order, by the fear of an Imaginary Evil.

2. Although *Purgatory* ſhould do no more hurt, at this day, it would deſerve to be baniſhed for the Evil it hath done. It is the Source, whence have ſprung ſo many ſhameful Productions, which diſhonour the Chriſtian

Chriſtian Name; ſo many fabulous Stories, falſe Miracles, returns of Souls, Viſionary Apparitions, and a Thouſand other things of this ſort. In a word, It's the Father of *Legends*, and the cauſe why the Chriſtian People, in moſt places, is yet fed with thoſe Windy Meats, and with that Word, which may well be called the *Antipodes* of God's Word. Shall that be counted for nothing, which hath ſo often ſerved a diſhoneſt Gain? And though it were poſſible to hinder theſe Abuſes, why ſhould we retain a Doctrine, which expoſes both the People, and the Conductors to ſo many Spiritual Dangers?

3. I would intreat theſe Gentlemen, that they would well remember the Principle which we have laid in the Subject of *Satisfactions* and *Indulgences*; it is, that to judge well what diſtance a Doctrine doth cauſe between one Religion and another, it muſt be regarded by that which is reduced to Practice. It's Practice which is ſenſible to the People; and the People is that Party properly, whoſe Reunion is in agitation. Upon that Fort, let them conſider of what importance is *Purgatory* in this Affair; it is the foundation of a great part of the Worſhip of the *Roman* Church; it is the foundation of *Satisfactions* and *Indulgences* whereof we have ſeen the Sequels to fill up all their Worſhip. *Purgatory* is the foundation of Prayer for the Dead, the cauſe of the Sacrifice, the occaſion of ſo many Maſſes, of Prayers and of Services, of ſo many Travels, of Pennances, of Vows, of Pilgrimages and Macerations. In a word, one may ſay, that all is done for *Purgatory* and Nothing almoſt for *Hell*. For an Act of Contrition, according to theſe Gentlemen, ſaves from Hell: But all the Contrition of all the Penitents together, would do nothing againſt the Pains of Purgatory. Men muſt paſs through them, or redeem them by Penible Works, by ~~Prayers~~, by Alms, by Maſſes

and

and Penances. So all the Strength of Devotion is turn'd towards that ſide. 'Tis clear then, methinks, that we cannot tolerate a Doctrine, whereupon is faſtened a Worſhip whereof we cannot participate, though our Life were laid thereon.

ARTICLE IX.

Of Sacraments in General.

WE have met with ſo many things which ſeparate us from the *Roman* Church, in thoſe Articles that we have now examined, that it is not very neceſſary to find ſome in this preſent Matter, which is that of the *Sacraments*. Monſieur *de Condom* paſſes it over lightly, haſtening to that of the *Euchariſt*, I will alſo follow him, and paſs by this place with the like ſwiftneſs. The Controverſies which regard Sacraments in general, their efficacy and their manner of acting, are for the moſt part moſt Metaphyſical, and therefore beyond the common capacity of the Vulgar. That of the neceſſity of Intention in the Miniſter thereof, is nevertheleſs of no ſmall importance. It deſerves well, that Mouſieur *de Condom* ſhould ſpeak a word of it. He did too much think of what he was Writing, that ſhe ſhould forget it. It ſeems he did not find colours good enough to cover that horrid uncertainty, wherein Chriſtians muſt needs continue, whilſt they ſuppoſe the validity of the Sacrament, to depend of neceſſity on the Intention of him that doth adminiſter it. For in fine, we maintain, that

on

on this Suppoſition one can nevet be aſſured, neither of having been rightly Baptized, nor that what is ador'd in the Euchariſt is no more Bread; and ſo, Men are never out of the danger of Idolatry.

About *Baptiſm*, doth only the abſolute neceſſity of this Sacrament, and condemn to death thoſe little Children, whoſe unhappineſs it is to die without receiving of it; but he brings no proof for it. I will only ſay, That what Monſieur *de Condom* adds is not very true, *That we fear not to ſuffer willingly our Infants to die like the Children of Infidels.* I know none but do fear that, and that will not do all that they can to hinder this miſhap; yea, we make no ſcruple of Baptizing them without our Churches, in caſe of neceſſity. But when the Providence of God prevents our care, and ſuffers it not to ſucceed, we would be very loath to damn to Eternity Creatures more often innocent than thoſe, who have given them birth; and which have the happineſs to be born within the Covenant of Grace.

Expoſ. p. 81.

About the Sacraments of *Confirmation*, *Extreme Unction*, *Order* and *Marriage*, Monſieur *de Condom* leaves the part of Explication, and takes that of Probation. Though the Proofs were worth any thing, I would not examine them; himſelf hath forbidden it us. [*If any one*, ſaith he, *ſhall think fit to anſwer this Tract, he is deſired to conſider, that for a meet Advancer of the Buſineſs to purpoſe, he muſt not undertake to confute the Doctrine which it contains,*] I have ſubmitted to this Law, and have conceived the Equity thereof. But in truth, without it I ſhould wrong my Lord of *Condom*, if I ſhould miſpend time in refuting all the Reaſons whereby he proves, that theſe four Ceremonies are true Sacraments. For

Expoſit. pag. 213.

I

I ſhould preſuppoſe, that he hath look'd on his Reflexions as ſo many good Proofs, and thereby I ſhould wrong his Judgment, ſince he will permit me to ſay, They are but ſmall Reaſons. And ſo, to do ſomething that may be to purpoſe, I will only ſay in General upon theſe Four Sacraments, That the Controverſie of multiplying Sacraments is not ſo light, as he thinks. Firſt, They are Ceremonies, and when Ceremonies are uſeleſs; they become very hurtful, and do load Religion in a moſt dangerous manner. But, as I deſign to extend this Conſideration further in the Sequel; I will not at preſent inſiſt thereon. I ſay then, Secondly, That Sacraments are the *Seals of the Covenant*; or if thoſe Gentlemen have an averſion for that Word, they are *Sacred Signs*, whereby God doth confer and confirm his Grace: Its then God's own Affair to inſtitute Sacraments, ſince it belongs to him, who makes the Alliance, for to confirm it. It is his part, who gives Grace, to ſettle the Means whereby he is willing to confer it; and we cannot keep our ſelves from regarding it as a great raſhneſs, that enterprize of giving Sacraments whereof God is not the Author, and whereof he ſpeaks nothing in his Word. What might we not ſay about *Marriage*, to ſhew how much Reaſon and Piety do ſuffer, when it is made a Sacrament? But that were to prove, and that is it we would not do.

Monſieur *de Condom* paſſes with the ſame ſwiftneſs over the Sacrament of *Penitence*. He tells us what it is, but he doth nothing towards his deſign; for he doth not ſhew us, that it is a little buſineſs, and that ſhould not ſtop us. Though he had undertaken it, he would find a hard task to effect it. It is a great Article, and about which we might have many things to ſay. I will not inſiſt on the infinite Difficulties of that Theology, which makes of a Chriſtian Vertue a Sacra-

Sacrament; nor of the ſore task they find, in aſſigning the Matter and the Form thereof. But I will ſay ſomething about the Four parts, whereof they compoſe it, except about *Satisfaction*, becauſe we have already ſpoken of it.

Confeſſion is a Yoke, which God hath not impoſed on the Church, and which ſhe is not obliged to receive. Let them not ſpeak of the good uſes thereof, for that would oblige us to ſpeak of the wicked Sequels of it, to dig up a thouſand Stories which would not pleaſe; and to repreſent the Queſtions which are made in their Confeſſions, according to the Directions of *Zanche's*, *Emmanuel Sa*, and other Authors yet more Authorized than thoſe.

Contrition is an excellent thing, but it is a great Miſhap, that they have put in its place I know not what kind of Repentance, whereto they give the Name of *Attrition*; It is a Grief that riſes from the ſight of the Pains of Hell, without any part or motion of Love to God. That is to ſay, That this Grief reſembles very much that of the Deſperate, who would wiſh that they had not committed Crimes, when they ſee the cruel Iſſues thereof. They pretend, that this *Attrition* is ſufficient, with the Sacrament of *Penitence*, for to be Juſtified and Saved by conſequent. So a Man may be Juſtified and Saved without having made ever any act of Love to God. They will tell me, That it is the Senſe of ſome particular Men: Yea, but thoſe particular Men maintain, That it is the Senſe of the Council of *Trent*. And certainly, either we are not capable of ſeeing any thing, or we ſee clearly that they have reaſon; for the Council ſaith, [*That this imperfect Contrition*; *which is called* Attrition, *becauſe ordinarily it riſes from the Conſideration of the vileneſs of the Sin, or of the fear of the Pains of Hell*;

Seſſ. 14. *c.* 4.

Hell; not only doth not make a man Hypocrite, but is a Gift of God and of the Holy Ghoſt; and though it cannot conduct the Sinner to Juſtification, without the Sacrament of Penitence, *yet it diſpoſes Man to receive the Grace of God in this Sacrament.*] Yet this Attrition, whereto the Council doth ſo much honour, is according to it, the fruit of the Holy Spirit, and of a Grace Supernatural. But others have paſſed ſo far, as to ſay, [*That it is probable, that it is ſufficient that* Attrition *be natural, ſo it be honeſt.*] It is true, will they ſay, but you ſee alſo how this Moral is treated at *Rome*. The Bull of *Innocent* the Eleventh fulminates it. I grant it; but I ſee alſo that the Parliament of *Paris* have condemned the Book of *Amedee*, and his deteſtable Moral; at *Rome* they cenſure the Cenſure of *Paris*, calling it, *Raſh, preſumptuous*, and *ſcandalous*. And when they condemn that Moral at *Rome*, they will not receive the Bulls thereof in *France*. Theſe Gentlemen may agree, when they pleaſe, about this Article, before they invite us to the Reunion. For without evaſion we declare, That we will never re-enter into a Church, where they tolerate People to ſay, *That Men may be ſaved, without having loved God in their whole life at any time.*

Bull of Innocent XI. *againſt* 65. *Propoſ. Prop.* 57.

I come to *Abſolution*. It is an Article that we will never paſs the Tribunal of the Church, according to us, ought to be occupied by Jeſus Chriſt alone. They ſhall never perſwade us to receive any other Judges. And never will they make us reliſh, that Crowned Heads ſhould humble themſelves at the feet of a Prieſt; and that a Prieſt, who is but a Man, ſhould undertake to ſay to other Men like himſelf, *I Pardon thee; I abſolve thee.* The Apoſtles themſelves, with their Apoſtolical Rod, did never uſe this Stile of

Empire

Empire and *Soveraignty over Conſciences.* They did proclaim Remiſſion of Sins to the Penitent; but we do not read, that they gave it with a Soveraign Power. Yea, our Lord himſelf was content to ſay, *Thy Sins are forgiven,* Math. 9. 2.

ARTICLE X.

Of the Euchariſt, of Real Preſence, and of Tranſubſtantiation.

I Begin this Article, as Monſieur *de Condom, We are at laſt arrived to the Queſtion of the* Euchariſt. But he muſt permit me not to continue like him; for he forgets the Laws which he had impoſed on himſelf. His Aim obliged him to prove nothing, and to refute nothing. The Intereſt of his Cauſe and of his Party lead him on another part, to ſay nothing, or to ſay very few things in his Explications; becauſe that to ſhew the Dogma's of his Religion on their fair ſide, they muſt ſhew thereof but a little Corner. In explaining them at large, a little, it would diſwrap them and unfold them, and ſo diſcover their feeble ſide. Yet was he willing to publiſh a Writing that ſhould have the extent of a little Book. Therefore, at every foot, he paſſes beyond the Bounds which he had preſcribed himſelf. In this place he enters in earneſt into the Diſpute, to maintain the *Real Preſence*; he ſtands on the Words of Inſtitution, *This is my Body:* He proves, that the figurative Senſe is a By-way. He calls to his help the Types of the Old Teſtament.

He

He abridges what the Gentlemen of *Port-Royal* have ſaid of the Laws and Rules of the Language, to prove that theſe Words, *This is my Body*, cannot be taken in a figurative Senſe. Yea, he refutes, and he anſwers: he labours to elude the Proof which we draw from theſe Words, *Do this in remembrance of me*; he expounds our Doctrine, and thence draws Arguments for himſelf. I grant, that all theſe ways agree not with my deſigned Method; and I ſhould reckon my ſelf to wander, if I ſhould Monſieur of *Condom* therein. I ſtill remember his Prayer, which he makes to him that ſhall deſire to anſwer this Treatiſe, [*He is intreated to conſider, that if he would advance any thing, he muſt not undertake to confute the Doctrine which it contains.*] Monſieur of *Condom* will permit me to tell him, That for to advance in his deſign, he ſhould not have undertaken to prove his Doctrine, which he had only a deſign to explain. Between him and us, at preſent, the Queſtion is not about the Truth of Doctrines, but only about their importance. [*The Queſtion is, Whether many Diſputes may vaniſh away by the Explications of the Faith of the* Roman *Church. And if the Diſputes remaining be as Capital, as we would at firſt have made Men to believe.*] Expoſit. 1. 5. He had undertaken to prove, that theſe latter Diſputes, according to our Principles, do not hurt the foundations of the Faith. Theſe are his Words. *Behold, what was his Buſineſs, and what he ſhould have done.* But he changes quite; he puts an Illuſion on us: He had promiſed us one thing, and doth another; for inſtead of proving, that the Doctrines of *Reality* and *Tranſubſtantiation*, according to our Principles, do not wound the Foundations of the Faith, he proves that they are true. I confeſs that this Turn is dextrous, having almoſt nothing to ſay to colour a Doctrine of that im-

portance, and not willing to paſs it by without ſpeaking thereof, he hath taken the part of proving it. Without ſcruple, I will paſs over his Proofs. Not but that I would do Juſtice to Monſieur of *Condom*, and would aknowledge here, as every where elſe, his Wit, his Delicateneſs, and his Dexterity, in turning curiouſly his ways of Reaſoning. But in fine, Methinks I have read nothing in this place, but what hath been ſaid many times, and whereto ſufficient Anſwers have been often return'd. It's very hard to terminate ſo grand an Affair with ſo ſhort an Inſtruction, ſo ſhort as we find here. I will content my ſelf therefore, to conjure thoſe who have any care of their Salvation, to conſult ſuch Authors as have written on this Matter, if the difficulties they may find in this place do occaſion any ſuch Scruple to ariſe in them. I can hardly believe, that ſuch a thing may happen; and I think, that thoſe who ſhall ſuffer themſelves to be taken thereby, ſhall have firſt deſigned to be deceived.

In all that Monſieur *de Condom* ſaith about the *Euchariſt*, there is nothing that maketh for his Subject, and tends to our purpoſe, but the Explication which he gives to our Doctrine, and what he calls *Reflexion on the Doctrine of the Euchariſt*. There, firſt he confeſſes, that there is nothing wherein we are ſo effectually oppoſite. So the Diſpute cannot be nullified by the Explications of our Beliefs. Very far from that, *the more we explain to the bottom, our ſelves*, ſaith he, *the more we ſhall find our ſelves contrary*. He alſo grants, that it is an important Affair. *There is nothing*, ſaith he, *which appears more important in our Controverſies, ſince the Queſtion is about the Preſence of Jeſus Chriſt himſelf*. So that Monſieur *de Condom* cannot yet do here what he had at firſt propoſed to do; that is, to ſhew, That the remaining Diſputes are not ſo Capital, as we at firſt would have made Men believe. He goes

yet

yet beyond all that. He pretends, that it is the only important Controverſie; and that if we can ſatisfie our ſelves about it, the reſt ſhall vaniſh eaſily away. That is it which theſe Words ſignifie, *One may wholly diſſipate, or reduce to very few things, the others Subjects of their Complaints, ſo that things be explained.* About all that we have ſomewhat to ſay. Expoſ. pag. 167.

First, We would fain have Monſieur *de Condom*, and all thoſe Gentlemen which do ſollicite us to a Reunion, to diſcharge themſelves of that Conceit, That this the ſole important Matter. I grant that Reality, with all its Attendants, is the moſt important of our Controverſies. And its Attendants are *Tranſubſtantiation*, *Adoration*, the *Sacrifice*, the *Retrenchment of the Cup*, and *Maſſes*, without Communicants. Yet, though they could ſatisfie us about them, theſe Doctors may know, that the reſt would ſuffice to retain us in the Separation that we are in. We will never worſhip *Creatures* nor *Images*, under whatſoever Pretence. It is not a buſineſs leſs Capital than that of the *Euchariſt*. We never will partake of a Worſhip compoſed of ſo many Ceremonies, ſo oppoſite to the Spirit of Chriſtian Religion. We never will ſuffer the Veil of an *Unknown Tongue* to cover Divine Service. We never will yield to a Diſcipline ſo relaxed, as is that, which ſettles *Indulgences*, and will never receive that great Pomp of *Human Satisfactions*. We never will acknowledge an Authority Superiour to that of Gods Word, and will never receive any other Univerſal Head of the Church but Jeſus Chriſt. Let none be deceived; all that appears Capital to us.

It is a great Illuſion, which the Doctors of the *Roman* Church offer continually to our People: They ſuppoſe to them, that *Real Preſence* is the only important Affair that we have with them; and that, to the end,

they may conclude that the reſt is nothing, ſeeing this Point is tolerable, according to us, ſeeing we tolerate it in the *Lutherans*. I therefore Advertize all, that have a care of their Salvation, to keep well their Guard on that ſide; to repulſe this Temptation, holding for certain what I now declared, That beſides *Real Preſence*, we have many more things than needs, to ſeparate us from the Communion of the *Roman* Church.

Another thing whereof Monſieur *de Condom* ſhall permit me to Advertize him, is, That granting the importance of the Controverſie of *Reality*, he conſiders *Reality* in it ſelf ſevered from its Attendants. He paſſes with an unconceiveable ſwiftneſs, *Tranſubſtantiation* and *Adoration of the Euchariſt*, as if it were nothing. He ſaith not a word of *Maſſes* without *Communicants*, and regards the *Sacrifice of the Maſs*, and *Retranchment of the Cup*, as Conſequences, which do riſe neceſſarily from the Doctrine of *Reality*, according to our own Confeſſion. So he makes his Fort of the *Real Preſence* only; and all this, becauſe he thinks to have found about it a great advantage in that we have done, in regard to the *Lutherans*. It is a Point, wherein we ſhall give ſatisfaction anon to them that ſincerely ſeek their Salvation and the Truth. Mean while we declare, that *Real Preſence*, preciſely in it ſelf and without its Attendants, is the leaſt of our Controverſies about the *Euchariſt*; that *Adoration*, *Tranſubſtantiation*, the *Sacrifice of the Maſs*, the *Retranchment of the Cup*, and *Maſſes without Communicants*, ſeem to us much more important. That thoſe Attendants are not, according to us, Natural Attendants of the *Real Preſence*, preciſely in it ſelf; they are falſe and evil Conſequences, which Men have drawn out of it. For it is but a bad Reaſoning, in our Judgment, to ſay, *The Body of Jeſus Chriſt is Spiritually*

ally and Invisibly under the Accidents of Bread *and* Wine; *therefore it must be Sacrificed, therefore it must be adored, and we must retrench the Cup from the People.* That is it which we shall particularly demonstrate.

But before that, I shall give a Third Advice upon what Monsieur of *Condom* saith about the importance of the Controversie of the *Real Presence*. It is, that granting it to be important, he dissembles all the Importance thereof. [*There is nothing*, saith he, *that appears more important in our Controversies, seeing the question is of the* Presence *of Jesus Christ himself.*] The Question is not only of that; but,

1. The Question is, Whether we shall oppose all the Lights of our Senses, which say, that the Signs of the Eucharist are *Bread* and *Wine*; and if we shall believe, that God doth continually offer illusion to our Senses, which is opposite to his Verity and to his Purity.

2. The Question is, Whether we must suppose, that God doth every Moment, and without necessity violate the Laws of Nature, that are most inviolable, which is opposite to his Wisdom.

3. The Question is, Whether we shall receive a Theology, whereof the Consequences destroy all Christian Religion; a Theology which confounds Body and Soul, and takes away the Bounds that distinguish them. A Doctrine, which supposing the Flesh of Christ becomes Spiritual, Invisible, subsisting under a Point, confounds the Body with the Soul. For I know not how else we can define the Properties of the Soul, but in saying, *She is Invisible, without Extension, without Space, and concluded under a Point.* This Doctrine also confounds Human Nature with the Divine; for it gives to the Flesh of Jesus Christ that which belongs only to his Divinity, that is, to be in many Places at

once, and be able to fill Heaven and Earth. It deſtroys the Article of *Aſcenſion*, and robs the Church of that Proof, which ſhe made uſe of againſt thoſe Hereticks who denied the Truth of the Human Nature of Jeſus Chriſt; for they oppoſed them by a Proof drawn from thence, That during the Life of the Lord, Men had always ſeen in him all the Actions, the Motions and Properties of Man. This Reaſoning will be nothing worth, if a Body can be without its Properties, and if the Properties of a Body can be without a Body.

4. The Queſtion is, Whether Men may ſettle ſuch a manner of Interpreting Scripture, which will overthrow all Scripture, and will give place to all Hereſies; if by one paſſage alone one muſt explain an hundred others, which ſeem to ſay the contrary; or if by the hundred, one ſhould explain that which is alone. For, for one only paſſage that ſaith, *That that which we ſee in the Euchariſt is the Body of Jeſus Chriſt*, there are ſeven or eight others which ſay formally, *That it is Bread and Wine.* *The Bread that*

1 Cor. 10. *we break. Whoſoever ſhall eat this Bread.*

1 Cor. 11. *Whenſoever you eat of this Bread. Let every one eat of this Bread.*

5. The Queſtion is to know, Whether we will belie our Lord Jeſus Chriſt himſelf, and the Holy Ghoſt, who tells us, *That we ſhall not have him always with us; that he was going to Heaven; that the Heaven muſt hold him till the reſtoration of all things.*

6. The Queſtion is, to know, Whether to avoid a Natural Figure in theſe Words, *This is my Body*, we ſhall expoſe Chriſtian Religion to the ſcandal of Infidels; yea, to the greateſt Scandal that can be imagined. For, in fine, whilſt they ſhall be able to reproach us, *That we eat our own God*, it is certain they will never come to us.

7. The

7. The Question is, Whether we should ruine one of the Sacraments of the Church, in destroying the *Bread*, in nullifying the Sign, and substituting in its place the Thing signified.

8. The Question is, to know, Whether we should draw down the Lord of Glory from the Throne of his Majesty, to nullifie him a second time; but with an Annihilation greater than that which he descended into after his Incarnation. The Question is to know, If this be to respect Jesus Christ our Lord sufficiently, to call him down back, by the help of three Words ill explained, to place him in Impure places, to expose him to be trod under feet, to be eaten by the Profane, to be mingled with Poyson and with Death, and to a thousand other Dangers that one dares not express.

9. The Question is to know, finally, If for a Corporal Communion, without which one may be saved, and wherewith one may be damned, and which consequently is not necessary to Salvation; we must overthrow all the Rules of Reason, of good Sense, of Grace, and of Nature. I know not, if after all this any one shall be able to say again, *Reality* and *Transubstantiation*, are not an Affair that should retain you, nor hinder you from re-entring into the *Roman* Church.

Monsieur of *Condom* saith thereupon Two things, which are to the purpose, and which are to be examined. The first is, That we have shortned our selves those great Spaces of Separation. *They have approached nearer to us*, saith he, *it is because we admit a Presence real*; *It is because our Catechism saith, That Jesus Christ makes us partakers of his proper substance*; *and our Confession of* Sunday 52. *Faith, That he nourishes us with the Substance of his Body and Blood. It is because we say, That although Jesus Christ be truly communicated to to us by Baptism, and by the Gospel*; *nevertheless it is*

but in part, and not fully. Thereupon my Lord of *Condom* Reasons after his manner, and as seems him good. *Behold then,* saith he, *the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ present in our Mysteries, by the Grant of* Calvinists. *Behold, Jesus Christ received in his proper Substance. Jesus Christ is given us in the Eucharist, in a manner which suits neither Baptism nor the Gospel, and which is wholly proper to this Mystery. It follows then, that this Participation is not fixed to the Faith, seeing that Faith being diffused generally through all the Actions of a Christian, is found in the Preaching and in Baptism.*

Expos. pag. 117, 118, 119.

Exp. 121.

First, I would fain know, what Service all this doth to the principal purpose of Monsieur *de Condom*, which is to reapproach us to himself. Are we nearer thereto because of some resemblance in the Terms? Though we had ill explained our Doctrine, and by Incommodious Terms; have we then changed it at the bottom? And doth not he confess himself, That the more we explain our selves, the more contrary we find our selves to be? So all the trouble he takes to convince us by our Principles is more than useless. At the most, we should only be convinc'd to have spoken in one manner, and to have thought in another. But we will not yield him that very pleasure of believing that justly. We speak as we think, and our Expressions are not, as they would perswade us, an effect of that Politick, which is ordinary to such as estrange themselves from the Truth. It is, that retaining the Sense of the true Church, they keep as far as they can possibly her own Expressions. We believe a Real Presence of the Body of Jesus Christ in the Supper, as we believe a Real Presence of the *Sun* upon Earth. No man intends to lie, nor doth he lie at all when he saith,

That

That was done in the preſence of the Sun. When the Sun is riſen, he is preſent to us. Yet no Man hitherto hath buſied his Head, to cauſe the *Sun* to deſcend from Heaven, and to ſhut him up ſubſtantially within one of his Beams. The *Sun* is really preſent by his Light, by his Beams, and by his Virtue. Chriſt's *Humanity* is preſent by its Virtue, by its Efficacy, by its Merit, which are as ſo many Beams. It is a Preſence moſt Real, though it be not Corporal. And I wonder how my Lord of *Condom* hath not learn'd it from his Scholaſticks: They that ſpeaking of the manner wherein Cauſes do act, ſay, that ſome do act *Immediatione Virtutis.* by an immediate Preſence of Vertues, and others *Immediatione ſuppoſiti*, by an immediate preſence of Perſons, of Suppoſt or Subſtance. Who ſhould ſay to thoſe Doctors of the School, *That their immediate Preſence of Virtue is a* Chimæra, *and is not a real Preſence?* I believe they make ſtir enough about it, being ſo much in love with wrangling.

We believe ſincerely, as we ſpeak it, that we are made partakers of the proper Subſtance of Jeſus Chriſt, becauſe we are not made partakers of the Subſtance of another; becauſe we receive the efficacy and merit of that Fleſh really. And that is all that is important to our Salvation in that Fleſh; for otherwiſe it's Nerves, it's Fibres, it's Bones, as ſuch, do not Sanctifie nor Juſtifie. The Fleſh profits nothing, it is the Spirit that gives life. If they will repeat to Eternity, [*That it is not poſſible to make it to be underſtood, that a Body which is not communicated to us, but in Spirit and by Faith, be really communicated to us, and in its proper Subſtance.*] We cannot help it otherwiſe, than to repeat always alſo, that the Spiritual Actions of the Soul are as real and more real, than the Corporal Actions of the Body. Though the Spirit alone, by Faith, do

Expoſ. pag. 181.

do ſee the Humanity of Chriſt Jeſus in Heaven; we believe that *that* Sight is more real, amd leſs ſubject to Illuſion than that of Bodies, which ſhall ſee Jeſus Chriſt with the Eyes of Fleſh; and I can hardly conceive, that Men can have their Comprehenſion of ſo great hardneſs, as not to be able to comprehend that.

In fine, We believe that our Lord Jeſus Chriſt is more fully communicated to us in the Euchariſt, than in Baptiſm; becauſe we have in the Euchariſt that which we have in Baptiſm, what we have in the Word of God, and ſomewhat more. It is not, that Jeſus Chriſt and his Graces can be divided; he that receives Jeſus Chriſt, receives him whole, intirely. Yet the more that Grace is ſetled in our Souls, the more Means God employs to fortifie it there, and the more ſo far do we partake of Jeſus Chriſt. Three are more than Two: When, after having received the Grace of Baptiſm, and Inſtruction by the Word, God doth alſo add thereto the Sacrament of the *Euchariſt*, it is certain that Grace is confirmed, augmented and eſtabliſhed thereby, and that we poſſeſs Jeſus Chriſt more cloſely ſtill. Beſides, that it is certain, that Jeſus Chriſt hath promiſed to communicate to us his Graces in a particular manner, and more efficacious in a Communion moſt devout, than in the Word; becauſe the Word doth propoſe Graces but in general, and a devout Communion applies them to every particular.

I will not touch what Monſieur *de Condom* ſaith upon theſe Words of our Catechiſm, Sunday 52. *That the Body of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, inaſmuch as it hath been once offered in Sacrifice to reconcile us to God, is now given to us to certifie us, that we have a ſhare in that Reconciliation.* I find what he ſaith thereon ſo fine, and of ſo great Subtilty, that I am aſſured, that they for whom this prin-

principally was written will hardly understand it; and that they who have a Spirit Metaphysical enough to enter into these abstracted Reflexions, I believe they also will have penetration enough not to entangle themselves therewith. *From p.* 124. *to p.* 126.

The other thing which Monsieur *de Condom* saith, which is to the purpose that we treat of, is, that we have offered Peace to the *Lutherans*, who believe the *Real Presence*; and that we have declared, that this Doctrine hath no Venom at all; that it doth not overthrow the Foundation of Faith; and that it should not break Communion among Brethren. And thereupon they tell us, That whatever Evil might be in the Opinion of the *Real Presence*, we have taken from our selves the right of prevailing thereby. Seeing that you tolerate it in the *Lutherans*, why should you not tolerate it in *Catholicks*? We oppose thereto, that they give Attendants to the *Reality*, which we cannot tolerate. Monsieur *de Condom* Answers, [*That no Subtilty of the Ministers shall ever be able to perswade Men of good Sense, that bearing with the* Reality, *which is the Point most important and difficult, they should not also bear with the rest.*] He adds, [*That by a secret Providence it hath happened that* Calvinists *have agreed, that supposing that we should take literally these Words,* This is my Body, *the* Catholicks *do Reason better and more consequently than the* Lutherans.] It would be presently a great rashness to hope that we may shut the Mouth of those Gentlemen about this Objection, which they have renewed within these 50 years more than a Million of times, and whereto Answer hath been made as often, without being able to obtain from them a Moment of Equity to

Expos. pag. 166.

Expos. pag. 168.

It is not then to them that I will speak, since they are resolved not to hear us; it is to them that seek their Salvation with a Spirit of Humility; and I pray them to consider,

1. That what we have offered to the *Lutherans*, is infinitely different from that which they demand of us at this day. We have offered to the *Lutherans*, to tolerate them in the Doctrine of the *Real Presence*; and they demand of us to re enter into the *Roman* Church to make Profession thereof. Have we offered to the *Lutherans*, to re-enter into their Communion to break our Assemblies to incorporate them with Theirs, and to make Profession of the *Real Presence?* We have offered only to them, in remaining still separate from them, as We are, both by Assemblies and by some Ceremonies external, little important; to tolerate them, to regard them as our Brethren, to receive them when they will come to us, without obliging them to an express abjuration of the Doctrines that separate us. Behold, what we have offered. And it is demanded of us, That abandoning our Assemblies, our Ceremonies, and our Doctrines, and particularly that of the *Real Presence*, we should re-unite; that is to say, that we re-enter, without any more ado, into the *Roman* Church, to believe the *Real Presence*, or at least to make Profession of believing it. There is so great difference between tolerating an Errour, and to make Profession of believing that Errour; that the former may be an action of Charity, and the second cannot be but an abominable Hypocrisie: The one serves towards Salvation, and by the other we evidently hazard our Salvation. I can say with assurance, that if we should re-enter into the *Lutheran* Church, and that we should bring back our People to them, to make their Profession of the *Real Presence*, we should commit a Crime that God would never pardon us. After that

that, they would have Miniſters to lead back their People into the *Roman* Church, without Myſtery, to make their Profeſſion of the *Real Preſence*, which is a thouſand times more dangerous, than what we tolerate in the *Lutherans*.

2. We may further tolerate the *Real Preſence* of the *Lutherans* without tolerating that of the *Roman* Church, becauſe there is a very great difference between the one and the other. But before we paſs further, it is good to remark, that what thoſe Doctours ſay is not true, *That we regard that Real Preſence of the* Lutherans *as a light Errour*. It is a great Evil, and to cure our Brethren of it, we would willingly have given half our own Blood. And what we have offered to tolerate them, it was principally in hope to bring them back, by little and little, from their wandring. If then we ſay, that their is no Venom in that Opinion, we underſtand it of mortal Venom, and a killing One. It is enough to confeſs ſome Venom in an Opinion, to acknowledge therein ſome Abſurdities, which diſhonour Reaſon, and blaſt Chriſtian Religion, and we acknowledge it too much in the Real Preſence of the *Lutherans*. But it is true, that we believe not that it deſtroys any foundation of Faith. We regard it principally in that manner, wherein it is expreſſed in their Confeſſion, which ſaith, [*Touching the Lords Supper, they teach that the Body and Blood of Jeſus Chriſt are truly preſent, and are diſtributed to them who eat at the Lords Supper, and condemn thoſe who ſay the contrary.*] There is nothing in theſe general Words that we might not ſubſcribe to. As for the manner of this Preſence, they are reſerved, and define it not. They ſay, *Jeſus Chriſt is there*; but we know not how. If there be any which do paſs raſhly further in ſetling what they call *Ubiquity*, that is to ſay, the Preſence of Chriſt's *Humanity* in all places of the World,

World, that paſſes not among them for a Fundamental Point.

The Real Preſence of the *Lutherans* doth not deſtroy the Bread, for they confeſs that the Signs are of true Bread and true Wine; and according to that, they do not ſuppoſe that God offers perpetually an Illuſion to our Senſes to make us ſee and feel a Body, where there is not a Body. They do not deſtroy the Sacrament, ſeeing they leave the Signs entire. The Real Preſence of the *Lutherans* hath not for Attendants the Adoration of the Euchariſt, and obliges not Men to adore a Creature. It doth not induce a Sacrifice of the Body and Blood of the Lord Jeſus Chriſt. Among the *Lutherans*, they have not retranched the Cup from the People. In fine, It is not accompanied with an infinite Number of Worſhips, of Ceremonies, and of Doctrines, which be incompatible with the purity of the Faith. In that Church, they do not Worſhip Images, they do not Invoke Saints, they do not proſtrate themſelves before Relicks; they ſerve God in a Known Tongue, they acknowledge no Mediator but Jeſus Chriſt; no other Satisfaction, but his Merit; any other Indulgence, but his Grace; any other Soveraign Authority but his own, and that of his Word. In a word, Let the *Roman* Church ſet her Real Preſence in the ſame ſtate, as is that of the *Lutherans*, and we will offer to them the ſame thing which we offer to theſe, ſo they will not ask us any more; that is to ſay, that we will offer them a Toleration, ſo that ſhe will not demand us to re-enter into her Communion. For yet one more, We never offered to conjoyn with the *Lutheran* Church, whilſt they abide in the ſtate wherein they are, and we will never do it for any thing in the World.

3. I muſt yet Advertize once more theſe Gentlemen, that for to know the poyſon of an Errour, one muſt principally regard it in that which is diffuſed on practice,

practice, both of the Worſhip and of Morality. Then for to know how dangerous the *Real Preſence* is, we muſt not regard it in her ſelf, but in the Attendants given it; that is, *Adoration*, the *Sacrifice*, and the *Retranchment of the Cup*. There it is that the danger lies, and that is it that the *Lutherans* have not. [*No ſubtilty of the Miniſters*, ſaith Monſieur *de Condom*, *ſhall ever be able to perſwade Men of good Senſe, that bearing with the Reality, which is the moſt important Point, and the more difficult, they ought not alſo to tolerate the reſt.*] How can the Ingenuity and Light of Monſieur of *Condom* permit him to ſay that? What if they tolerate a Speculative Opinion, which changes nothing in the Worſhip and in the Religion, ſhall we be obliged to tolerate the Adoration of a Creature, which is of all things moſt oppoſite to the Foundations of Faith? If a Man be perſwaded that God is in the *Sun*, by a preſence of Subſtance, greater than that wherewith he is in the reſt of the World, it would be an abſurd Opinion. But I know not whether there be any Perſon, that would damn a Man for that alone; but if that Man would conclude from that Errour, that Men ought to worſhip the *Sun*, and ſhould himſelf ſo worſhip it, what Sentiment ſhould we have of him? As for me, I would tolerate his Errour as a Viſionary Thought; but I would abhor him as an Idolater, becauſe of his Concluſion. If then to perſwade Men, it may be ſufficient to expreſs things with a great Aſſurance; I ſay, there will never be any ſubtilty or diſguiſe that may perſwade Men of good Senſe, that Toleration for a *Real Preſence*, ſhould induce to a Toleration for the Attendants, which the *Roman* Church gives it. They ſay to that, *That they are not Attendants given thereto, but that they are Natural Attendants, and that even the* Calviniſts *do agree, that ſuppoſing that one muſt take literally theſe Words*, This

is

is my Body; *Catholicks reaſon better and more Conſequentially than the* Lutherans.] We do not confeſs, that it is good that the Publick ſhould be advertized of it. It is a ſurprizing Slander, that Facts of this kind ſhould be advanc'd without proof. Monſieur *Daille*, in his Apology for the Reformed Churches, employs a whole Chapter to prove the contrary. Monſieur *de Langres* hath publiſhed a Sermon upon theſe Words, *Be ye ſuch, as to give no ſtumbling Block neither to the Jew nor to the Greek*; wherein he proves, *That Adoration is not an Attendant of the* Lutherans *Real Preſence*; and I will make it appear, that it is not an Attendant even of the *Roman* Churches Real Preſence. If any of ours have confeſſed what Mon-Monſieur of *Condom* ſaith, it was in the heat of Diſpute againſt the *Lutherans*, and we make no difficulty to diſown it. But the following Articles will oblige us to penetrate further into this Matter, and to prove, that *Adoration*, the *Sacrifice*, &c. are not Natural Attendants of the Real Preſence.

ARTI-

ARTICLE XI.

Of the Adoration of the Hoſt.

WE are going to make a Chapter of a Point, whereon Monſieur *de Condom* hath made but one Period; which is this, [*I will not ſtay upon the Point of* Adoration, *becauſe the moſt Learned and moſt Judicious of our Adverſaries have long ago granted us, That the Preſence of Jeſus Chriſt in the Euchariſt, ought to carry to Adoration thoſe that are perſwaded thereof.*] And after that they would accuſe *Anonyme*, that he had accuſed Monſieur *de Condom*, to paſs by the difficulties which he finds moſt troubleſom, Is it poſſible that Monſieur *de Condom* ſhould imagine, that we are ſo deprived of common Senſe, to ſuffer our ſelves to be ſurprized by ſuch Illuſions? He will not ſtay upon the Adoration of the Eucharift. He ſhall do what pleaſes him; but he may permit me to ſtay thereon, and that I may ſhew to all them, who are ſollicited to change their Religion, that this is a Capital Affair; and that for this Article alone, there is no leſs danger than of their Salvation, by ſuch a Change.

Expoſ. pag. 143.

Advertiſ. pag. 88.

I have no need to ſtand upon that Truth, which is acknowledged of all the World, that God doth abſolutely forbid the *Adoration* of the Creature under Eternal Pains. I will obſerve only, that in the buſineſs here in agitation, we tread not upon Thorns, as we do at other times, when we are obliged to expreſs the Senſe of the *Roman* Church. For Example, when we ſpeake

ſpeak of the Worſhip, which they render to the *Saints* and *Images*. We know not in what Terms to ſpeak the Truth; for within this ſhort time theſe Gentlemen thruſt on their Delicateneſs to the extream. Here it is not ſo. As they keep no meaſure, they do not oblige us to keep any; the moſt Scrupulous ſpeak freely; they ſay roundly, *That Men muſt adore the Sacrament with Adoration of* Latria. They are the terms of the Council; *There is no plea for doubt, but that all the Faithful, according to the Cuſtom, which hath always been received in the Catholick Church, owe to this moſt Holy Sacrament, in the veneration thereof, the Adoration of* Latria, *which is due to the True God.*

Conc. *Trid.* Seſſ. 13. cap. 9.

Let us learn what is meant by this Adoration of *Latria*. It is a Soveraign Adoration; it is an Act of infinite Annihilation of the *Creature* before the *Creator*; it is a Worſhip which concludes all the Acts of *Faith* and *Love*, *Hope* and *Admiration*, *Confidence*, *Zeal* and *Acknowledgment*; and in general, all Homages due to a Being infinitely Good and infinitely Merciful. Behold, what they would have us to render to that, which we conſider but as a Creature. This is the buſineſs which they would diſpatch in a Period. To know of what importance this Adoration is, let's firſt conſider it in reſpect to our Principles, and then we will conſider it with reſpect to the Principles of Monſieur *de Condom*, and of his Church.

I muſt then entreat theſe Gentlemen, that they would preſuppoſe for a moment with me, that we Reaſon in giving a figurative Senſe to theſe Words, *This is my Body*. In a moment I will have for them the ſame Complaiſance which I now ask of them, and I will ſuppoſe, that the Senſe which they give unto theſe Words be true, In this Suppoſition, that here is no

Real

Real Preſence, no *Tranſubſtantiation*, I pray them to conſider what is done in adoring this Sacrament. They worſhip *Bread*; and I know not whether *Bread*, how holy ſoever it be, be more worthy to be adored than the *Sun* and *Stars*, which are ſo beautiful, and wherein God's Image ſhines with ſo much brightneſs. What would be ſaid of a Man, that ſhould worſhip the Water of Baptiſm, the Sounds of God's Word, the Characters of the Holy Scripture? I confeſs that the Sacraments, though one ſhould even ſuppoſe that Jeſus Chriſt is not concluded within it, is a thing moſt holy, and moſt venerable. But there is an infinite diſtance between *Reverence* and *Adoration*. We owe reſpect to the Goſpel and to Baptiſm, we owe them no Adoration.

But here is a Thought, whereby we know very well, that many Perſons who are not very well perſwaded of the *Real Preſence*, do flatter themſelves and others. *Although*, ſay they, *the Body of Jeſus Chriſt were not there, whatever it be we adore it; wherever it be our Adoration doth terminate in him; and we ſhall always have this Reaſon to give before the Throne of God, I had intention to adore you.* I am perſwaded that this Excuſe ſhall not be received by the Judge of the World. He muſt then juſtifie almoſt all the Pagans, who in adoring the Creatures had an intention of Adoring God. Then ſhould he ſhew favour to thoſe *Jews* which adored the *Golden Calf*, for they had an intention to adore God. That appears evidently enough in what they ſay of that Calf, *Theſe are thy gods, O Iſrael, which have brought thee out of the Land of* Egypt. Can they be thought brutiſh enough to have thought, that the figure of this *Calf*, which was but now made before their Eyes, had brought them out of *Egypt* before it was made? Who ſees not, that they regarded this *Calf*, as the Image and

Emblem

Emblem of that Great GOD, who had done ſo many Wonders in their favour? Yet had the Wrath of God almoſt conſumed them with all their good Intentions. And if one believes the *Jews* of this day, their preſent Calamity is ſtill an Attendant thereof; for they have a Proverb that ſays, *That in every one of their Miſeries there is a part of the Golden Calf.* Men ſay, *I direct my Intention to Jeſus Chriſt, whatever part he be in.* In Conſcience let them tell me, if a Man, which with the like direction of Intention ſhould adore the *Sun* and the *Moon*, would be innocent? Jeſus Chriſt is not there, but he may be there, he is there at leaſt by his Divinity. It is true, there are ſome particular Doctors in the *Roman* Church who have advanced this Doctrine, *That one may worſhip God in any Creature: Proſtrate himſelf before a Beam of the Sun, under which a* Demon *ſhould lie hid; yea, before a* Straw, *before a* Piſmire, &c. *ſo that Intention be directed towards God.* But I will believe that honeſt Men do not reliſh this ſtrange Theology. Men ſhould know, methinks, that Errours can never excuſe Crimes, unleſs ſome Errours of Fact, and even ſupportable Errours. One ſhall not be acquitted for ſaying, *I believe*; for the Judge will Anſwer, *You ſhould have inform'd your ſelf, and have been inſtructed.* What difference find they between the language of a Pagan, that ſhould ſay, *I believed that the* Sun *and* Moon *were gods, therefore I adored them*; and that of a Chriſtian that ſhall ſay, *I believed that the Sacrament was Jeſus Chriſt, therefore I adored it? There is a great one,* ſay they; *The Scripture hath ſaid nothing which ſhould give ground of believing, that the* Sun *and* Moon *are to be worſhipped; but it hath ſaid, That the* Euchariſt *is the Body of Jeſus Chriſt. So, although that ſhould not be ſo, God would be obliged to pardon me, ſince he hath*

Vaſquez, lib. 3. diſp. 1. cap. 2.

given

given occaſion to the Errour, by the Words which he hath uſed. That is the Queſtion, whether Scripture give place to the Opinion of the *Real Preſence* by its Expreſſions. There is no Heretick but would eſcape the Judgment of God by that way; for there is none that pretends not, that the Scripture hath given place to his Hereſie. A Text ill underſtood, can never ſerve to excuſe neither an Hereſie nor a Falſe worſhip. *Origen* teaches us, *That the Ancient Fathers that preceded him, had imagined, that God had given the* Sun *and the* Moon *to the Nations that they might worſhip them; chooſing rather that they ſhould be Idolaters, than Atheiſts,* They grounded this Opinion upon a Text which is read in *Deuteronom.* 4. *When thou ſhalt ſee the* Sun *and the* Moon, &c. *thou ſhalt not bow down before them, and ſhalt not ſerve them; for the Lord hath given them for a Portion to all Nations that are under Heaven*; that is to ſay, according to the gloſs of *Juſtin Martyr* and *Clement Alexandrin: He hath given them to be the Objects of their Adoration of People.* If the Pagans had had the knowledge of that Text ſo ill explained, and that they would thereby juſtifie themſelves, would they be accepted thereto? If a Woman ſhould defile her Bed, committing Adultery with a Man that ſhe had taken for her Husband, upon ſlight appearances, ſhould ſhe be the leſs Criminal for it? When Men are in danger of taking away from God, that which pertains to him alone, for to give it to the Creature, one had need take all Securities poſſible. Doubt not of it, it is a Worſhip which cannot be forgiven, to adore God in the Creatures, and to adore the Creatures under Intention of ſerving God. It is a deep Hypocriſie to proſtrate ones ſelf before the Sacrament, being perſwaded that it is but *Bread*, or even in doubting whether the Body of Chriſt Jeſus be there. Therefore I cannot forbear to remark by the

by,

by, that there is Cruelty in them that would have Proteſtants to proſtrate before the Sacrament, when they meet it. It is to oblige them to an action of Hypocriſie, yea, to an action of Cruelty: For every Man that proſtrates himſelf externally before an Image, which he doth not adore with adoration of heart, he is a Profane Man as well as an Hypocrite. See then with what Juſtice theſe Gentlemen would oblige us to re-enter into the *Roman* Church before we be perſwaded of the *Real Preſence*, for to commit there, in adoring the Sacrament, which we regard as *Bread*, the moſt Criminal of Actions that can be committed in the Divine Service.

Conſidering the manner wherein Monſieur of *Condom* Reaſons, I believe he will eaſily grant me what I proved but now, That even in ſuppoſing *Real Abſence* in the Sacrament, one might not render it Adoration of *Latria*. But I paſs further, and now will ſuppoſe with him, that theſe Words, *This is my Body*, ſhould be taken in the Senſe of the *Real Preſence*; and I maintain that with this Suppoſition, *To adore the Sacrament is a Fault that cannot be forgiven, and a Worſhip which overthrows the Foundations of Religion.*

Firſt, If we ſuppoſe that Jeſus Chriſt is in the *Euchariſt*, theſe Gentlemen will permit us to ſuppoſe it with all the Exceptions, which themſelves bring thereto. According to them *Jeſus Chriſt* is there, but he is not there infallibly. Want of Intention in the Prieſt, a defect in the Matter; if they put into the hands of him that celebrates, a Body which is not well compoſed of *Flour*, a Liquor that be not *Wine*; if the Prieſt be not Baptized, if he be not a Prieſt; if he hath forgotten to pronounce theſe Words, *This is my Body*, which may happen too often, becauſe they recite the Canon of the Maſs without thinking of it,

and

and with great ſwiftneſs. In all theſe Caſes the *Body of Chriſt* comes not, Conſecration is not done. Thoſe that aſſiſt at the Celebration of the Myſtery, cannot then have a perfect certainty, that what they adore is *Jeſus Chriſt*. Yet we ſee them proſtrate themſelves, and give the Worſhip of *Latria* to that Object, which according to their Principles may be nothing elſe but *Bread*. Would not that put Men into a fright? What Remedy can Men find againſt ſo great a peril? Shall it be to oblige the Adorers to ſay, *I adore you my Saviour, if you be there?* Here would I atteſt the Conſcience of theſe Gentlemen, and would ask them, *If of a thouſand Adorers, or it may be of a Million, if there be any one that doth make this Reſerve either with Mouth or Heart?* All the World adore in earneſt, as if it were indubitable that *Jeſus Chriſt* is there; but do they believe that Men were excuſable, though they ſhould make that Reſerve in adoring it? Should Men ever expoſe themſelves to the peril of rendring an Infinite Homage to a Creature, and to annihilate ones ſelf before that which is Nothing? *You worſhip what you know not*; this was the Crime of the *Samaritans*. Seeing it is impoſſible to clear ones ſelf abſolutely, even within the Principles of the *Real Preſence*, whether *Jeſus Chriſt* be truly in the *Euchariſt*: Is it not better to worſhip him in that place, where we know him to be aſſuredly?

But let's put on our Complaiſance for theſe Gentlemen, as far as it can go; let's be more *Catholick* than they; let us ſuppoſe that the *Body* of Jeſus Chriſt is always undoubtedly in the *Euchariſt*. I will demonſtrate, that even in this laſt Suppoſition, it cannot be lawful to adore the Sacrament. I ſay, Demonſtrate; for if I be not extreamly blinded, I do not believe there is a Demonſtration more ſenſible than what I am going

going to ſay. I will therefore firſt lay down thoſe Principles which theſe Gentlemen will grant.

1. *That God is every where, that he fills all places, and penetrates all Creatures, and particularly all Bodies; yet would it be an Idolatry to adore him in the Creatures, that is to ſay, to adore Creatures wherein he is.* For Example, God penetrates by his Subſtance *Dogs* and *Horſes*; he penetrates all *Marble* Statues and *Braſs*, which have been made to repreſent the Worthies of the Pagans, or their Falſe gods. Yet it would be truly Idolatry, if one ſhould proſtrate himſelf before thoſe Animals, or before thoſe Statues, to adore them, under pretence, that God fills them.

2. My Second Principle is, *That the Body of Jeſus Chriſt, according to the Doctrine of the* Roman *Church, is in the Bread of the Euchariſt after the manner of Spirits, without extent, without diviſion, inviſible, inpalpable*; and to ſpeak it in other terms, *The Body of Chriſt Jeſus doth not fill the Bread in another manner, than the Subſtance of the Deity doth fill the Braſs or Marble.* If any ſay, that this Principle is falſe, and *that the Subſtance of the Body of Jeſus Chriſt doth fill the Signs of the Euchariſt, by the annihilation of the Subſtance of the Bread and Wine, whereas God doth fill the Marbles without altering their Subſtance.* I will Anſwer, That this doth nothing againſt our Principle. If the Preſence of the *Humanity* of Jeſus Chriſt in the Euchariſt doth annihilate the Subſtance of the Bread, it is becauſe God would have it ſo, for to place the Subſtance of Jeſus Chriſt under the *Bread*, it's not worth the pains to annihilate the Subſtance of the *Bread*. It is evident, that the *Fleſh* of the Lord, which penetrates it ſelf in the Euchariſt, could alſo penetrate the Subſtance of the Bread. That Anſwer would therefore ſerve only to let us ſee the uſeleſsneſs of *Tranſubſtantiation*, and of the *Annikilation* of the *Subſtance* of the

the Bread. In truth, ſeeing they had need here only of the *Real Preſence*, it was not worth the pain to add thereto *Annihilation*, or *Change of Subſtance*, which adds a thouſand difficulties to thoſe of the *Real Preſence*. However it be, I pretend that according to the Principles of the *Roman* Church, the Fleſh of Jeſus Chriſt is not otherwiſe in the *Euchariſt*, than the Subſtance of God in Common Bread, or within any other Body. The *Fleſh* of Jeſus Chriſt is wholly entire in the whole *Euchariſt*; it is entirely whole under every part thereof. The Subſtance of God is entirely whole in every Body, and wholly entire under every one of the Parts of that Body. The *Fleſh* of Jeſus Chriſt is wholly entire out of the *Euchariſt*, as it is wholly entire within it. The Subſtance of the *Divinity* is wholly entire without every Body, and wholly entire within that Body. The *Fleſh* of Jeſus Chriſt is in the *Euchariſt* in a manner indiviſible and without extenſion. The Subſtance of God is within each Body, without any diviſion, and without any extenſion of Parts. In fine, I am aſſured that one cannot find any Eſſential difference, and that may concern our Subject, between theſe two Manners of Subſiſting; One of the *Divinity* in all Bodies, the other of the *Fleſh* of Jeſus Chriſt in the *Euchariſt*.

3. My Third Principle is, *That the Divinity, which ſo penetrates all Bodies in the World, is infinitely more adorable than the Fleſh of Jeſus Chriſt, which penetrates and fills the Signs of the Euchariſt. For the Divinity is adorable by himſelf, and becauſe of himſelf; but the Humanity of Jeſus Chriſt is only co-adorable*, as the Ancients have ſpoken; that is to ſay, that it merits not to be adored, but becauſe it is Perſonally united to the *Divinity*.

4. In fine, my laſt Principle is a Truth of Experience and Senſe; it is, *That the Change which is wrought*

wrought in the Signs of the Eucharist, hinders not the Signs from being entirely filled with Creatures. The Substance of Bread and Wine is therein no more, I suppose it with those Gentlemen. Yet let them take a Loaf of Bread of whatever bigness they please, let a Priest consecrate it; let it be traversed, penetrated on all parts; let it be divided and broken into parts almost imperceptible: yet every where we still find something figur'd, colour'd, round, or square, or triangular, white or black, small or big; and all that we taste in penetrating this Subject on all sides, they are Creatures.

These *Principles* then being laid, see how I reason. If it be permitted me to adore the Sacrament of the *Eucharist*, which is all replenished and filled up with Creatures, only because the *Flesh* of Jesus Christ doth fill it in a Spiritual manner, without division and without extension; why should it not be permitted to adore the *Marble* and the *Brass*, which are full of the *Divinity*, which is infinitely more adoreable, and which is present in this *Brass*, in that manner that the *Flesh* of Jesus Christ is present in the Signs of the *Eucharist?* Or else I thus turn my Reasoning; God is present in this *Marble*, he fills it. he is there in a manner incomprehensible and adorable. Yet is it not permitted me to prostrate my self before this *Marble* to adore it; to take parts thereof to be adored by the Faithful, or to carry them in Pomp. Why? Because that if God be in the *Marble*, there is also a Creature there, it is full of it; and I could not adore this Subject, which is in part Creature, in part Creatour; but that I should thereby give a Soveraign Adoration to the Creature, that which the Creatour doth Soveraignly detest. I make application of my *Principles* to my Subject. It is true, the *Flesh* of Jesus Christ is in the Species of the *Eucharist*; but under those

thoſe Species all is full of Creatures, of Accidents, of Figures, of Colour, of Quantity. I could not therefore adore therein my Creatour, but at the ſame time I muſt adore the Creature, which is conjoyn'd to him. If they know any Anſwer to that Proof, they will do us a kindneſs to give it us. After that believe thoſe Gentlemen, when they tell us with an aſſured Tone, *That the Preſence of Jeſus Chriſt in the Euchariſt ought neceſſarily to carry them towards Adoration, that are perſwaded thereof,*

If the Adoration of the *Euchariſt* be not an Attendant of the *Real Preſence*, as the *Roman* Church conceives it; by ſtronger Reaſon, the *Real Preſence* of the *Lutherans* will not carry them to Adoration, who are perſwaded thereof; for it is well known, that the *Lutherans* do keep the Subſtance of the *Bread* after Conſecration. They do not believe it to be Annihilated. That Subſtance of *Bread*, which remains in their Sacrament, ſhould cauſe in them more fear, than the Accidents do to the *Roman* Church. They ſhould fear to adore the Creatour in a Subject, which remains a Creature after Conſecration, as much as it was before. So that theſe Gentlemen do make Illuſion to the Publick, when they ſay, *That, by the* Calviniſts, *Grant, the Catholicks do Reaſon more conſequentially in this Subject, than the* Lutherans *do.*

Before we conclude this Article it is good to mark, that Monſieur *de Condom* doth ſuppoſe, *That all the* Lutherans *reject not Adoration; Some of them,* ſaith he, *reject Adoration.* The moſt of them then do receive it, ſince there are but ſome that reject it. Monſieur *de Condom* teaches us there ſomething new. Theſe are Facts important enough, not to be advanc'd without Proof; but that doth not very much concern us. If Monſieur *de Condom* be not deceived, we declare to him, *That the* Lutherans, *which adore ſo, are not*

thoſe to whom we offer Union; with a good heart we declare Anathema *to ſuch.*

But let's grant them alſo this Point: Suppoſe that the *Lutherans* do Reaſon leſs congruouſly than the *Roman* Catholicks; what imports it me? To Reaſon ill, not to know how to draw a Conſequence, is it a Crime againſt *Piety* and *Religion?* A Man may have odd Opinions, whereof, if he perceives the Conſequences, he might ſee that they ruine all Religion; but he abhors thoſe Conſequences, and rejects them. Another, which hath the ſame Opinions, hath more penetration; he ſees the true Attendants of his Principles, he admits them, he ruins all. Becauſe that my Charity obliges me to bear the Fancies of the former, ſhall I be obliged to tolerate the Impiety of the latter? The *Lutheran* believes, *That the Body of Jeſus Chriſt is preſent in the Euchariſt*; if he did reaſon Conſequentially, he would ſay, *Then I muſt adore him there.* In ſo Reaſoning and ſo Adoring, he would commit, according to us, a very great Evil. But he doth not think good to Reaſon in that manner; therefore he will not adore it; he keeps to his Fantaſtical Opinion, to believe, *That Jeſus Chriſt is preſent in the Subſtance of the Bread.* The *Roman* Catholick holds with him the *Real Preſence*; but he goes further, he Reaſons better, if they pleaſe and concludes, that they muſt Adore; according to me he becomes guilty of an extream Evil. Is it the ſame thing? Becauſe I tolerate the firſt with his Erroneous Opinions, ought I to tolerate the ſecond with his Worſhip, which I find abſolutely incompatible with the purity of Religion, although he Reaſons more Conſequentially than the firſt? In a word, It imports us but little that People do not Reaſon well, ſo that they do no Evil. If any Man, as *Hercules* furious, ſhould take his Children for little Monſters, and yet ceaſes not from Careſſing them, he

is

is not Criminal; but if in ſuppoſing that theſe Children be Monſters, and in reaſoning Conſequentially, doth cruſh his Children to death, becauſe Monſters muſt be ſo ſerved, he is guilty of Murther.

I will only add now two Reflexions in favour of thoſe for whom I write, they are ſuch who in good earneſt do ſeek Inſtruction about the Truth. The firſt is, *That we ſhould not, after all this, trouble our ſelves to prove to the* Roman *Church, that they adore the Creature with the Creatour in the Sacrament of the Euchariſt; for they agree therein.* Theſe are the Terms of the Council of *Trent*; *We muſt render to this Holy Sacrament the Adoration of* Latria. The Sacrament is compoſed of the *Fleſh* of Jeſus Chriſt inviſible, and of the ſenſible Accidents of *Bread* and *Wine*. They adore the whole Sacrament; they adore then the Accidents of *Bread* and *Wine*, which are the Creatures. And thereupon we may not forget to remark it to theſe Gentlemen, that they are unjuſt to invite us to Re-union, until they ſhall have proved, that one may innocently render to the Creature this Adoration of *Latria*, which even, according to them, ought to be rendred only to the Creatour.

The other Reflexion is, *That we may alſo exempt our ſelves from entring into the bottom of the Queſtion; and ſay, That although it might be true that Jeſus Chriſt is in the Euchariſt, and that one might adore him there, I would ſtill hold me to my practiſe, which is to Worſhip only in the Heavens.* Reaſon ſuggeſts to us, that in all things we ſhould take the ſureſt part, and leſs dangerous. If the *Body* of Chriſt Jeſus be not in the *Euchariſt*, they that adore this Sacrament commit an infinite Evil. If the *Body* of Jeſus Chriſt be there, they that worſhip him not, as there, do no Evil at all, or their fault is ſo light, that Men know not what Name to give it. I do not adore Jeſus

Chriſt in the Euchariſt, becauſe I know not whether he be there; I am not the more Impious thereby, becauſe I adore him in Heaven, where I know he is. But he that adores the Sacrament, if Jeſus Chriſt be not there, he adores the Creature, and his fault is infinitely greater than mine.

I will make ſenſible, by one Example, the great difference that is between the *Roman* Catholick, in caſe he be deceived about the *Real Preſence*; and that of the Proteſtant, in caſe he be miſtaken in holding *Real Abſence*. Suppoſe we that a King hath two ſorts of Subjects; ſome are ſcrupulous and fearful, they will not render homage to their Prince whilſt he lies hid in his Retirements, inacceſſible and inviſible to all the World, becauſe they fear that the King is not there; but as ſoon as this King comes forth to appear in publick, that they hear his Voice, they proſtrate themſelves before him, and do render a perfect Obedience. The other Subjects are in an Extremity quite oppoſite; They not only Reverence the King without ſeeing him, and without knowing him; but meeting an unknown Perſon calling himſelf their King, though he be not, without further inquiry, they ſuffer themſelves to be ſeduced by light Appearances, joyn this falſe Prince to their true King, and render the ſame honour to this Imaginary Soveraign, as to their true Prince. Is it not very eaſie to diſcern the difference which is between theſe two ſorts of Perſons? Hardly can one find the ſhadow of Sin in the firſt ſort; but it is clear, that the Second ſort are guilty of Treaſon. Their Ignorance doth not excuſe them, ſeeing that in ſuch Affairs Men are obliged to get Inſtruction. We are thoſe ſcrupulous Subjects, we will not adore Jeſus Chriſt where we are not ſure that he is; but we adore him where he is aſſuredly. We are not then guilty, neither of refuſing to our Prince the Homage we owe him; nor of

giving

giving to any other what we owe only to him. The *Roman* Catholicks are thoſe other Subjects ſo imprudent, that they ſuffer themſelves to be deceived by him who is not their Prince, and which render him the ſame Honours as to their King. This Reaſoning and this Example do manifeſt evidently, I think, that the *Roman* Church could without any Risk adhere to our Worſhip, and not adore Jeſus Chriſt in the *Euchariſt*, though he were there; becauſe that adoring Jeſus Chriſt in Heaven, that would ſuffice to keep them from being Impious. But for us, it is impoſſible to adhere to their Worſhip, if Jeſus Chriſt be not there, ſince we ſhould hazard the adoring what is not God. This is what I had to ſay of *Adoration*; after that, I leave it to be judged, if it were a buſineſs to be ended in a Period. It is great Wiſdom in Monſieur *de Condom*, to have drawn a Curtain of *Silence* over a Worſhip, for the Juſtification whereof nothing was to be ſaid. But the Care of our Salvation muſt oblige us not to abide by that which he hath ſaid unto us; for we muſt conſider this Article as being capable of keeping us in an Eternal Separation from the *Roman* Church, though it were that alone, about which we could not agree.

ARTICLE XII.

Of the Sacrifice of the Maſs.

WE are come at laſt to the Sacrifice of the *Maſs*. This is the place wherein they believe, that Monſieur *de Condom* and the Author of the *Advertiſement* do triumph in Explications and in Sweetnings. I wonder how the World do blind themſelves without any appearing Reaſon: As for me, I never conceived any thing in the Sacrifice of the *Maſs*, but what Monſieur *de Condom* makes us ſee therein; and yet have I always minded that Affair, as the greateſt that can be between two Religions. I always believed that, according to the *Roman* Church, the *Euchariſt* was made a true Sacrifice. Doth Monſieur *de Condom* deny it? On the contrary, he ſpeaks it in Terms as expreſs as may be. [*So the Son of God is put on the Holy Table, by virtue of theſe Words, &c. Jeſus Chriſt being preſent doth there renew and perpetuate, in ſome ſort, the Memory of his Obedience to the death of the Croſs. So that nothing is wanting there to be a true Sacrifice.*] And a little after, [*A Sacrifice nevertheleſs moſt true, in that Jeſus Chriſt is truly contained and preſented to God under this figure of Death.*] I always conceived, that this Sacrifice is not only a Sacrifice of *Thankſgiving*, but that it is truly Propitiatory. Dare Monſieur *de Condom* deny it? I think not; for they are the very Words of the Council of *Trent*, [*Docet Sancta Synodus Sacrificium iſtud verè Propitiatiorum. The Holy Council declares, that it is a Sacrifice truly Propitiatory.*] And I find, that Monſieur *de*

Expoſ. pag. 145, 146.

Seſſ. 22. cap. 22.

de Condom agrees thereto in these Words, [*We think that this Oblation causes God to become more propitious to us, and therefore we call it Propitiatory. We present to God the Lord Jesus Christ in a true Sacrifice, as our only Victim, and our only Propitiation by his Blood.*] Pag. 148. Either I understand nothing in these Terms, or they signifie, that we offer the Lord Jesus Christ in a Sacrifice truly *Propitiatory* to God, to render him propitious to us, and to obtain remission of our Sins. It is a true Sacrifice, according to Monsieur *de Condom*; it is also a *Propitiatory Sacrifice*, according to him. There is no need of Logick to conclude; then, according to him, it is a Sacrifice truly *Propitiatory*. In fine, I have conceived, that in this Sacrifice the Church doth the Office of an Offerer; that Jesus Christ is the Victim, and that God is he to whom they offer that Oblation truly *Propitiatory*. Have we been mistaken? I think not; for I believe I see that very thing in these Words of Monsieur *de Condom*, *We unite our selves to him in that state, and we offer him to God as our only Victim.* This is the state of the Controversie, and I never conceived another.

To annihilate this Controversie, those Gentlemen fain some differences among us, that never were. The Author of the *Advertisement* saith; [*That we regard with horrour the Sacrifice of their Altars, as if they should make Jesus Christ to die once again.*] *Advertism.* pag 46. We declare, that we never had such a thought. I conceive not how these Gentlemen have forgotten, that one of our Proofs against this Sacrifice is drawn thence, That Jesus Christ dieth not there. We say, there never was a true Sacrifice of a living Oblation, wherein the Oblation did not receive death. How

then ſhould we accuſe them, to cauſe *Jeſus Chriſt* to die on their Altars? Monſieur of *Condom*, to cauſe to reapproach to him, amplifies the Terms of *Sacrifice* and *Commemoration* which they and we make uſe of, becauſe we agree, that the *Euchariſt* is the Commemoration of the Sacrifice of *Jeſus Chriſt*. He concludes, that then, according to us, it is a Sacrifice of *Commemoration*. We muſt not miſtake here; there is difference between *the Commemoration of a Sacrifice*, and a *Sacrifice of Commemoration*, as between the Day and the Night. In fine, Monſieur of *Condom* labours hard to tell us, That they have no deſign to offer to God a new Payment, and that it is not a new Oblation. We know it well enough; the Council of *Trent* had told us ſo, and even had ſaid more too; [*It is,* ſaith it, *one ſingle and the ſame Oblation; and he that offers himſelf now by the Miniſtry of the Prieſt, is the ſame that offered himſelf on the Croſs.*] But both that avail any thing towards the bottom of the Queſtion? Be it the ſame Oblation and the ſame Sacrifice, and conſequently the ſame payment; will that hinder the Queſtion from remaining the ſame, *viz.* If it be juſt and reaſonable to preſent daily *Jeſus Chriſt* in a Sacrifice truly Propitiatory for the Sins both of the Living and of the Dead?

Seſſ. 22. cap. 2.

We muſt preſently ſee, whether this be ſo ſmall a Controverſie as they would perſwade us; and if we can re-enter into the *Roman* Church whilſt this Sacrifice ſhall ſubſiſt there. To diſpatch this difference, I muſt pray the Doctours to make ſome Reflexions with me.

1. I will ſuppoſe a Truth which cannot be gainſaid; that is, *That Sacrifices have always made up the Eſſence of that which they call the* Externals of Religion, *and conſequently they are always an Eſſential* differe-

difference among Religions. With the Pagans, one Religion was made to differ from others by their Sacrifices; *Paganiſm* was different from the *Judaiſm* by their Sacrifices, which had another Object, another Matter, and which were done in Ceremonies very different. In fine, It ſeems to me, that the Eſſential difference for the Exteriour, between the Religion of the Ancient *Jews* and that of the *Chriſtians*, conſiſts, in that they had Sacrifices, and we have none; for it is not, that we ſerve another God than that of the *Iſraelites*; it is, that we ſerve him otherwiſe. That being ſo, is it not true that there is an Eſſential difference among *Chriſtians* that have Sacrifices, and they that offer none? If there had been any *Jews* who had denied the Neceſſity of Sacrifices, and who had condemned the uſe of killing Oblations in the Temple of *Jeruſalem*, would not thoſe People have been the Abomination of all the reſt of the People? If they had made a Party; if they had ſeparated, and that they had built a new Temple where they had offered no Sacrifice to God; had Men believed that thoſe People had had the ſame Religion with the other *Jews*, becauſe they had worſhipp'd the ſame God who brought them out of *Egypt*? If it be the Intention of Jeſus Chriſt, that there ſhall be in his Church a perpetual Sacrifice of his *Body* and of his *Blood*; we muſt not flatter our ſelves, we follow not the Religion of Jeſus Chriſt. But if that continual Sacrifice hath not been inſtituted by the Lord, aſſuredly they make a new Chriſtianiſm, and a new Religion. The Queſtion then is to know, if without any other Myſtery we ſhould paſs into a Religion which is Eſſentia ly different from ours?

2. But it is not only the Queſtion to know, If Men ſhould introduce into the Church a new Sacrifice; but, *if Men ſhould Sacrifice the Lord Jeſus Chriſt, the*

Son

Son of the Living God. It is the greatest Oblation, the Noblest and most important in the World. And that deserves well, methinks, to have Reflexion made thereon before we engage to Re-union, whereto they invite us. If any rash Person would sprinkle with the Blood of *Oxen* and *Sheep* their Altars, according to the Usage of all People and of the Ancient Church, there would not be Thunders enough to crush to death such an Undertaker. If such an Impious Man should form a Society, wherein they might practice such Sacrifices, they would arm all the Powers of *Christianism* to abolish such a Religion. Yet would that agitation be but about the Sacrifices of some Beasts. The business is, to Sacrifice the *God of Heaven*, the *Master of the World*, and they will perswade us; that it is a business of Nothing.

3. The Question again is to know, *Whether they should put into the hands of a Man the GOD of the Universe, as an Oblation, in the hands of a Sacrificer*; that is, *if we should debase the Creatour into the hands of a Creature?* It is a Truth, which good Sense dictates among all Nations and all Ages, that the Sacrificer is greater than the Oblation. *Heb.* 7. 7. *Without contradiction, the lesser is blessed of the greater.* It is the Principle of St. *Paul*, the *Priest blesses the Oblation.* They put the Lord Jesus Christ into the hands of a Priest, as an Oblation; they then lift up the Priest above Jesus Christ. We cannot but have regard to that, as to a very good Affair.

4. We cannot also keep our selves from seeing, that this Doctrine doth annihilate the *Priesthood* of Jesus Christ by good and legitimate Consequences; *If the Lord Jesus Christ was to have Successors in his Office of* Priest, *he is not then himself an Eternal Priest.* Either St. *Paul*'s Reasoning is bad, or my Proof

Proof is invincible: For, in fine I Reaſon like him. He ſaid, *If Perfection had been in the Levitical Prieſthood, was it needful that another Prieſt ſhould ariſe after the Order of* Melchiſedeck, *and who ſhould not be called after the Order of* Aaron? *The Prieſthood being changed, there muſt of need be a change of the Law.* I ſay the ſame: If Perfection was found in the *Prieſthood* of Jeſus Chriſt, who is the Eternal Prieſt of *Melchiſedecks* Order, why ſhould Men introduce new Prieſts, which much more like to be after the Order of *Aaron*, than after the Order of *Melchiſedeck?* And if the ſetling of a new *Prieſthood* after the Order of *Melchiſedeck*, hath overthrown the *Levitical* Prieſthood; doth not the *Prieſthood* of theſe Sacrifices annihilate the *Prieſthood* of Jeſus Chriſt? [*This is your Errour*, ſay they, *you ſuppoſe that this is a new Prieſthood, and it is not ſo; for it is the ſame, it is the Prieſthood after the Order of* Melchiſedeck, *which is Eternal, becauſe it abides ſtill in the Church; and without that the Sacrifice of Jeſus Chriſt would not be Eternal, after the way of that of* Melchiſedeck.] Why would Men oblige us to believe things that are incredible, to juſtifie the Church of *Rome?* They tell us, *That the Prieſthood of their Prieſts, is the ſame as that of Jeſus Chriſt.* I know not whether Heaven and Earth are more diſtant, and if Light and Darkneſs be more different. Jeſus Chriſt is God, thoſe Prieſts are Men. Jeſus Chriſt abides for ever; thoſe Prieſts die. No Man ſucceeds Jeſus Chriſt; Prieſts ſucceed one the other. Jeſus Chriſt offered not for himſelf; the Prieſts offer for their own Sins, as for thoſe of the People. Jeſus Chriſt is *Holy, ſeparate from Sinners*; Prieſts are often engaged into great Diſorders. Jeſus Chriſt hath offered once one ſole Sacrifice; theſe offer every day, and reiterate their Sacrifice,

Heb. 7. 11, 12.

crifice. Jeſus Chriſt finiſhes his Sacrifice in the *Holy Places not made with hands*; Prieſts make their Sacrifices upon Altars of Stone, and in Temples made by Mans hand. In fine, *Melchiſedeck* was a ſingular Man, and only; it muſt needs be therefore, that he who was to ſuſtain that Prieſthood, whereof his was the Figure, ſhould be a ſingular and only Perſon; but the Prieſts are in great Numbers. After that, can Men deny, that *Prieſts* are Sacrificers much rather like the Order of *Aaron*, than that of *Melchiſedeck*? And if it be ſo, we ſay it once more, The Eſtabliſhment of their Prieſthood deſtroys that of Chriſt by good Conſequence.

Though that ſhould be granted, ſay they, *it is a diſavowed Conſequence, and which by conſequence ſhould not prove an obſtacle to the Re-union.* To that I ſay, Though Men diſavow it, yet we ſee it and fear it ſtill, becauſe it produces actually its effect. It is not in Points of Practiſe, as in thoſe of Speculation. In theſe it is true, ſo the Conſequence be diſavowed, it muſt not be imputed, although it do ariſe from the Speculative Principles of thoſe that diſavow it. But when a Practiſe or Worſhip deſtroy by conſequence an important Truth, that is in vain to diſavow the Conſequence, while People remain in the Worſhip, and in that Practiſe they are actually guilty of having done prejudice againſt ſuch a Truth. For Example; A Pagan doth joyn to the Adoration of God, the Sovereign, many Inferiour Deities. We tell him, That by this Worſhip he offers a great Wrong to the Soveraign God. He may Anſwer, *That it is a Conſequence which he diſavows, and that his Intention is, to render an infinite Honour to this Soveraign God.* Becauſe he diſavows the Conſequence, is he juſtified?

5. Finally,

5. Finally, We cannot keep our ſelves from ſeeing, *That the Sacrifice of the Maſs doth a great diſhonour to the Sacrifice of the Croſs; for if it be needful to reiterate every day that Sacrifice, the firſt Oblation which was made thereof muſt have been inſufficient.* We Reaſon as the Apoſtle, that ſaith, *The Sacrifices that are offered every year, cannot ſanctifie them that have recourſe to them; otherwiſe they had ceaſed them from offering them, ſince the Offerers being once ſanctified, ſhould have had no more Conſcience of Sin.* Hebr. 9. We Reaſon as theſe Doctors themſelves: We ſhall hear one of them preſently ſaying to us, *If the Maſs were infinite, it were in vain to offer many Maſſes.* Let's be permitted to ſay alſo, *If the value of the Sacrifice of the Croſs were infinite, it is in vain to offer ſo many others.*

It is here that Monſieur *de Condom* pretends that we are much in the wrong, becauſe, according to him, *The Sacrifice of the Maſs offers no prejudice to that of the Croſs*; the Reaſon which he gives, is, *It's a new Payment of a new Propitiation.* He ſaith not, that it is not a *new Sacrifice*; yet the Council of *Trent* inſinuates it, ſaying, *It is the ſame Oblation, and the ſame Prieſt*; and the Doctours ſay it expreſly. But it is a terrible Paradox to ſay, That a Sacrifice, wherein no Perſon dies, wherein there is no effuſion of Blood, which is done upon an Altar, and which is done at this day towards the end of the World, be the ſame ſingular Sacrifice which was done almoſt 1700 Years ago, on the Croſs whereon Jeſus Chriſt died, and did ſhed his Blood. Not only, it is not the ſame ſingular Sacrifice; that it is not a Sacrifice of the ſame kind, for here Jeſus Chriſt dies not. Monſieur of *Condom* tells us, *That Jeſus Chriſt is upon the Altar but only in a Figure of real Death of the Signs, which repreſent his Death.* It is natural to conclude, that he is there

there Sacrificed as he dies; he only dies in Figure there, he is then Sacrificed but in Figure there. He dies not there truly; he is not then offered in a true Sacrifice. However it be, one ſhall never ſay, that will follow the language of Reaſon, That an Action wherein Jeſus Chriſt died really, and another wherein he dies but in ſome Signs, be one and the ſame Sacrifice. In fine, Although Jeſus Chriſt ſhould be in the *Euchariſt*, and that in the Sacrifice of the *Croſs* and of the *Maſs* there ſhould be but one Oblation, would it follow, that it were but one Sacrifice? Doth the *Oneneſs* of the Sacrifice depend ſolely upon the *Oneneſs* of the Oblation? Doth it not alſo depend on the *Oneneſs* of the Action? If God had raiſed every year that *Goat*, which was offered for the People in the Feaſt of *Propitiation*, and that it had been killed every year, becauſe it had been the ſame Oblation, it could never yet be ſaid, that it had been one and the ſame Sacrifice.

They ſay again, *That it is not a new Payment, nor a new Propitiation; that they do only apply the Propitiation of the Sacrifice of the Croſs; that it is the ſame Jeſus Chriſt who is offered; that it is his Merit which is preſented.* What doth all that do? We ſay not, that the Sacrifice of the *Maſs* doth wrong to the Merit of Chriſt Jeſus, for we know well that have deſign to offer Jeſus Chriſt and his Merit in the Sacrifice of the *Maſs*. But we ſay, That this Oblation reiterated of the ſame Satisfaction, doth accuſe of inſufficiency the former Oblation. Either *Jeſus Chriſt* hath not ſufficiently offered to his Father his Infinite Merit; or the Oblation thereof, which they repeat every day, is uſeleſs. For if the Oblation done in the Croſs be ſufficient, all other Oblation is ſuperfluous; or if the other Oblations be not ſuperfluous, certainly that of the *Croſs* is inſufficient, whatſoever theſe Doctors

ctors ſay. They have a deſign to make application by this Sacrifice of the *Maſs*, of the efficacy of that of the *Croſs*; that doth not hinder from being a new Sacrifice in the Church. It is moſt certain, that the *Moſaical* Sacrifices were deſtined to apply the efficacy of the Death of *Jeſus Chriſt*, and of his Sacrifice to come. Mean while, they were not the ſame Sacrifice as that of the *Croſs*. And if any this day make application to himſelf of the efficacy of the Death of *Jeſus Chriſt* by the death of a Beaſt, it would not be a *Sacrifice*, but a *Sacriledge*. In a word, It imports us not, why, and to what end they preſent *Jeſus Chriſt* every day in a true Sacrifice. They do it, and this Enterprize ſeems to be very ſurprizing, terrible, and abſolutely oppoſite to the declaration of the Holy Spirit, who ſaith, *That Jeſus Chriſt doth not offer himſelf ſeveral times.* Whatever Intention Men have, God will not be paid with that Intention; and will always judge, that they have done wrong to that Oblation, once made, capable of *ſanctifying for ever thoſe that are ſanctified.* *Heb.9.25.*

Beſides that, I would fain know, if they can ſay in Conſcience, *That Jeſus Chriſt died purpoſely to obtain for us all things, for which they offer this Sacrifice of the Maſs.* It is not only for the Remiſſion of Sins; it is for the preſervation of Health, for the Cure of a Diſeaſe, for the Proſperity of an Enterprize, yea, and for the finding out of thoſe things that are loſt. In a word, There are but few things, though never ſo baſe, for which they do not celebrate the Sacrifice of the *Maſs*; by the favour of this Word of the Council of *Trent*, for other *Neceſſities*. It is impoſſible we ſhould count for nothing ſo great an Abuſe as that is, to offer the Son of God, his *Fleſh* and his *Blood*, which the Angels adore, for things of this

this Nature. And we cannot comprehend how they can ſay, *That it is the ſame Propitiation of that of the Croſs*; for it is certain, that the Lord hath not ſuffered on the Croſs, to obtain for Men theſe ſorts of Goods. Monſieur *de Condom* muſt alſo give me the permiſſion to ask him, how that which is taught in the *Roman* Church, *That the value of the Sacrifice of the Maſs is Finite*, can agree with what he ſaith, *That it is the ſame Payment as that of the Sacrifice of the Croſs?* *Bellarmine* proves very well, that the value of the *Maſs* is finite, [*If the Value of the Maſs were Infinite, it were in vain to offer many Maſſes to obtain the ſame thing; for if one Maſs alone were of an Infinite Price, certainly it were ſufficient to obtain all. Of what uſe were it to offer others?*] The following Words appear remarkable to me; [*One may prove the ſame thing by the Sacrifice of the Croſs, which is ſingular, not to be repeated, only becauſe it is of an Infinite Value, and that it acquired a Price for all the Sins which are to be pardoned, both future and paſt.*] Can any diſtinguiſh more neatly the two Sacrifices, and the two Payments; that of the *Croſs*, and that of the *Maſs?* One is Infinite, the other limited: One is never repeated, becauſe it is Infinite; the other is daily reiterated, becauſe it is of a Finite value. *Bellarmine*, will they ſay, *hath no deſign to oppoſe the Council of* Trent; and in the ſame place he proves, *That the Sacrifice of the Maſs, is the ſame Sacrifice with that of the Croſs.* It is true; but theſe Doctors ſay what they pleaſe, and they would have us to believe them, even when they lay down things incompatible.

Bellarm. de Miſſ. lib. 2. c. 4. 55.

I

I do not believe it neceſſary to ſtay long upon what Monſieur *de Condom* ſaith, *That the Sacrifice of the Maſs is an Attendant of the Real Preſence.* If that Reflexion were ſolid, it would do for us, and it could not ſerve, but to give us Averſion for the Doctrine of *Reality*, whoſe Attendants ſhould be ſo ſtrange, and would tend to eſtabliſh a New Sacrifice, that is to ſay, a New Religion. But we cannot agree, that the Sacrifice of the *Maſs* be an Attendant of the *Real Preſence.* It may be an Iſſue, if Men pleaſe, becauſe it followed after it, and that they have made a *Propitiatory Sacrifice* of the *Euchariſt*, only after they had imagined a *Real Preſence* of the *Fleſh* of Jeſus Chriſt. But it is an Iſſue which hath no foundation, but in Illuſion; for in truth it is clear, That the *Fleſh* of Jeſus Chriſt, in whatever manner it be given us, is only given us but to be Eaten, and not to be Sacrificed; ſeeing the Lord commands us to Eat his *Fleſh*, and never ordains it to be Sacrificed. If the *Real Preſence* did neceſſarily induce the Sacrifice, it were becauſe Men ſhould Sacrifice the Lord Jeſus Chriſt, wherever he is. Were it ſo, he were then to be Sacrificed in Heaven. So in this place, no more then about *Adoration*, we cannot grant that the Catholick *Romans* do Reaſon more Conſequentially than the *Lutherans*, becauſe theſe which hold the *Real Preſence*, do not yet make a Sacrifice of the *Euchariſt.*

Yet once more, I have no deſign either to prove nor refute, and I will hold me religiouſly within the Bounds which I have mark'd out for my ſelf. Therefore I will not examine all that Monſieur *de Condom* ſaith, to expound the Epiſtle to the *Hebrews.* It is one of his digreſſions, done for ſwelling his Work. He ſhall ſay whatever he pleaſes; but he ſhall never make them believe, who ſhall preſerve but a little

liberty

liberty of the Spirit, that this Epiſtle be favourable to the Sacrifice of the *Maſs*. Never will Men comprehend the reaſon of the Silence of the Apoſtle upon this matter, in a place where he treated to the bottom, both of the *Sacrifice* and of the *Chriſtian Prieſthood*. This were a manifeſt prevarication; and if having wherewith to ſatisfie the *Jews*, who would have by all means Viſible Sacrifices, he had not put into their hands the Sacrifice of the *Maſs* to impoſe Silence on them. Monſieur *de Condom* would believe he had done much, if he could but draw this Epiſtle from laying ſo heavy upon his Party, and had proved that it doth nothing againſt him. Alſo hath he no other end in his Reflexion, it is not a thing to be diſpatch'd in Eight or Ten little Pages; but though he had done it, he had yet done nothing to purpoſe. It is not enough to have proved, that this Epiſtle contains not Proofs againſt the Sacrifice of the *Maſs*. They ſhould find therein Proofs for this Sacrifice; for it is there that they ought to be, if there were any in the Scripture; and if they find none in that place, it is a prejudgment, that they cannot be found in any part.

ARTI-

ARTICLE XIII.

Of the Retranchment of the Cup.

BEhold the laſt of the Conſequences of *Tranſubſtantiation* and of the *Real Preſence*, it is the *Retranchment of the Cup*, and *Communion under one kind*. Monſieur *de Condom* finds in his Theology, that it is ſo natural a Conſequence thereof, and ſo neceſſary, that thoſe who confeſs or tolerate *Real Preſence*, ſhould find it no trouble to Communicate under one kind. If it were true that the *Retranchment of the Cup* were a neceſſary Attendant of the *Real Preſence*, it were to us a new Reaſon againſt the receiving thereof; but it concerns me little whether that Conſequence be good or bad. It is a Controverſie which I leave to the *Bohemians* to diſpatch, and to the *Germans*, *French*, *Bavarians*, and to ſo many others, who did in the laſt Age demand with ſo much inſtance, the Reſtitution of the Communion under both kinds; and who notwithſtanding believed *Tranſubſtantiation* and the *Real Preſence*.

I will ſay only Two things thereupon. The firſt, That the Church, which during a Thouſand years entire, by the Confeſſion of theſe Doctours, Adminiſtred the Communion under both kinds, did not believe the *Retranchment of the Cup* were a needful Attendant of the *Real Preſence*; ſeeing that, if we believe them, that ſame Church believed alſo that *Real Preſence*. I grant that it is an aſtoniſhing thing, That during the Ten firſt Ages Men ſhould not have that Scruple, which they have had in the following. In thoſe Times when Men accounted it a greater honour to wear on their Face the mark of their Sex, than they do this day;

day; I know not how then Men ſhould not abhor, to ſee after the Communion a thouſand Bodies of Chriſt Jeſus, hanging at the Beard of a Mariner. They have not thought of a Remedy to be ſought for that Scandal; but ſince *Berengarius*, and ſince the eſtabliſhing of the Doctrine of *Tranſubſtantiation*. One had need be very dull, methink, and thick Skulled, not to be ſenſible, that theſe new Precautions, which they ſince that began to be thought of, are an evident Proof, that there hath been Innovation in the Doctrine.

The other thing I would ſay is, That I found a Word in the Book of Monſieur *de Condom*, which makes me ſuſpect, that himſelf is but ill perſwaded, that the *Communion under one Kind* is an Attendant of the *Real Preſence*. [*In the Conſecration*, ſaith he, *the Body and Blood of Jeſus Chriſt are myſtically ſeparated, becauſe that Jeſus Chriſt ſaid ſeparately*, This is my Body, This is my Blood, *which doth include a lively and efficacious repreſentation of the violent Death which he ſuffered.*] If the *Body* and *Blood* be myſtically ſeparated in Conſecration, why ſhould they not be ſo in the Communion? If Jeſus hath ſaid ſeparately, *This is my Body, This is my Blood*; hath not he alſo ſaid ſeparately, *Eat, Drink*; *He that eats my Fleſh*, and *He that drinks my Blood*? In fine, If the Signs be ſeparated in this Sacrifice, to induce a lively and efficacious repreſentation of the violent Death of Jeſus Chriſt, why do they not alſo give them Separately at the Communion, ſeeing they make there the Commemoration of that Violent Death, and that Men participate there of the whole efficacy of that Death? If Monſieur *de Condom* would thus Reaſon upon the Principles which he himſelf hath laid, he ſhould then Reaſon as *Cajetan* and many other Able Men have done, who did believe *Tranſubſtantiation* and the *Real Preſence*. All that may ſerve to make

it

it appear, that the *Lutherans* do not Reaſon ſo ill as Men would perſwade us, when they ſever the Doctrine of the *Real Preſence* from all thoſe Attendants, which they give it in the *Roman* Church.

But that is not my principal Affair. Here it is; It is to make known, that Monſieur *de Condom* hath no reaſon for deſiring to perſwade us, that this *Retrenchment of the Cup* is nothing important, and that it ſhould not hinder us from Reunion to the *Roman* Church. The Chriſtian Religion, according to us, hath but Two Sacraments; and ſhould it be nothing important to us, to ſee raviſhed from us the Moiety of one of theſe Sacraments at one blow? I know not how that can be ſaid, ſeeing, that according to our Principles, he that divides the Sacrament deſtroys it, and he that deſtroys it robs the Church of it. They would have us reckon for nothing, an Attempt, happily the ſtrangeſt which was ever ſeen in Religion. All the World agrees, that our Lord Jeſus Chriſt hath Inſtituted this Sacrament under both Species; that Antiquity hath ſo practiſed it, and after Fourteen hundred Years they come to ſnatch it out of our hands. Theſe Doctours, who boaſt of ſo perfect a Conformity to the Ancient Church, do abandon it in this place, which is of the chiefeſt importance. They grant it, they are not aſhamed of it; and they would have us like it, and that we ſhould account this Enterprize for nothing. What, can we account for nothing ſo manifeſt an Infraction of our Maſters Orders, which ſaid ſo expreſly, *Drink ye all of it?* It will avail nothing here to ſay, *That this Command is not addreſſed to all the Faithful, but to the Prieſt alone.* It is an Illuſion, which I have no deſign to encounter. The buſineſs is to know, whether, in our Principles, we cannot Communicate under *one kind*. Now, ſeeing that after our Principles theſe words, *Drink ye all of it*, are addreſſed to all the Faithful;

we

we cannot, retaining our Principles, Communicate under one Kind, without being Hypocrites, Prevaricators and Rebels againſt the Orders of our Lord.

But to make Men ſenſible how much this Enterprize is terrible, and this Affair important, I beſeech them, who have a Care of their Salvation, to make with me the following Reflexions.

1. That in all Sacraments and Sacrifices, and generally in all Sacred Ceremonies of the Law, there were parts ſo Eſſential, that in ruining them Men had entirely deſtroy'd that part of Divine Service; and of a Sacred Ceremony they had ſo made a Sacrilege. *Moſes* had ordained, that every day twice, *in the Evening and Morning*, the *Holocauſt* of a *Lamb* ſhould be offered. It is that which the Law called, *The Continual Sacrifice*. If they ſhould have offered but one *Holocauſt* at Noon, and that they had Sacrificed a *Bull* inſtead of a *Lamb*, is it not evident that it would have been a manifeſt Prevarication, and that this Action would have paſſed before God for an Abomination? God had alſo ordained, That on that Solemn day, which they called *of Propitiations*, they ſhould preſent two *Goats*; that one of them ſhould be Sacrificed for an *Holocauſt*, and that the other being charged with the *Iniquity of the People*, ſhould be *ſent into the Deſart*. If they ſhould have preſented but One *Goat* inſtead of Two, is it not evident that the Propitiation had not been made, and that God would have conſidered that as a ſignal Prevarication? And that an *High Prieſt*, that had been guilty of ſuch an Attempt, would have been put to Death without Mercy? As for me, though I ſhould ſtrive, yet cannot I perceive what difference there is between ſuch Facts, and This whereof we now treat. Jeſus Chriſt hath eſtabliſhed us a Sacrament under both kinds of *Bread* and *Wine*, he ſaith, *Eat, Drink*. At a blow, ſuddenly they ſteal away

away one Moiety from us, they rob us of the *Wine*, consecrate; they forbid us to drink thereof, and they would have us to regard that as a Sacrament, and as the same Sacrament.

2. Let's consider besides, that the Efficacy and Virtue of Sacraments depend absolutely on their Institution and the Will of their Author. For, in fine, at the bottom, to eat a little of the Flesh of a roasted *Lamb*, to suffer some Violence in ones Flesh by *Circumcision*, to be washed with a little *Water*, in it self cannot be of any Virtue. And *Ceremonies* have no Efficacy, but because God hath instituted them, and hath promised to accompany them with the Virtue of his Grace and of his Spirit. But is it not true, that he hath not promised to accompany Sacraments with his Virtue, but on Condition that Men should keep close to the *Ceremonies* that himself hath Instituted? *Circumcision* was to be done in certain Parts; if they had done it on the *Lips* or *Ears*, instead of being a Seal of the *Covenant*, it had been a depravation evident of the *Covenant*, which would have provoked God instead of procuring his Grace. They were to roast the *Paschal Lamb*, to eat it with *bitter Herbs*; if instead of that they had roasted a *Beef*, or had boiled the *Lamb*, and that they had eaten this *Lamb* with a sweet Sawce; who can deny, but that instead of a Sacrament it had been a Sacriledge? God would not have shed any Virtue on that corrupted Ceremony, and this Change would absolutely have ruined the Efficacy of the Sacrament. If instead of Baptizing with *Water*, any should Baptize with *Dirt*, or any other such thing; or in retaining *Water*, any should alter visibly the Sense of the Sacramental Words of Baptism, *I Baptize thee in the Name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost*; could Men believe that this Sacrament would confer Remission of Sins? It is clear

that God hath engaged himſelf to give his Grace with his Sacraments; but not with Mens Sacraments. When Men change the Inſtitution of a Divine Sacrament, they make an Human Sacrament, to which God hath promiſed nothing. Therefore it is a moſt clear Evidence, that in retranching the Moiety of the Signs in the Sacrament of the *Euchariſt*, they ruine the Efficacy thereof, they baniſh the Spirit of God, and eſtrange his Grace from it. For Jeſus Chriſt hath not promiſed to afford his Grace, but to ſuch Sacraments as he hath inſtituted, and as he hath inſtituted it. After that, they ſhould have us reckon it for nothing, that they take from us one of the Means whereby this Saving Grace and Efficacy are communicated; is that Juſt?

3. Theſe ſame Reflexions make us ſee, with the fulleſt Evidence, that the *Retranchment of the Cup* deſtroys and ruins the Sacrament of the *Euchariſt*. For a Sacrament is a certain Aſſemblage of Ceremonies inſtituted of God; and if you take away one part of theſe Ceremonies, it is no more the ſame Sacrament. That appears by what I have ſaid of the *Paſſover*, *Circumciſion*, and *Baptiſm*; in which, if Men ſhould make any notable Change, by way of *Retranchment*, they would have ruined them: I ſay, by way of *Retranchment*, becauſe one may alter Sacraments, by way of Addition, without ruining them. The vain Ceremonies which the *Jews* had loaden the *Paſſover* with, did not abſolutely deſtroy it; and the uſeleſs Pomp, wherewith they have cloath'd the Sacrament of *Baptiſm* among Chriſtians, hinders not its Efficacy. When the Eſſential parts remain, what is added doth incommodate and hurt, yea, load the Subject; but the Eſſence of that Subject ſubſiſts. But when they have taken away one of the Eſſential parts, all things which Men add beyond the Inſtitution, can-

not

not reſtore what they have ſpoiled. And thence it is clear, that both the Signs being equally Eſſential in the Sacrament of the *Euchariſt*, they could not retranch one without ruining the whole Sacrament intirely. We muſt not therefore diſſemble, that we regard not the Communion in the *Roman* Church as a Sacrament. They may not therefore wonder, that we cannot Communicate with them, while it ſhall remain in the ſtate wherein it is.

4. Finally, We muſt remark that this *Retranchment of the Cup*, which they would reckon for nothing, doth oppoſe and ruine all the Ends for which the *Euchariſt* hath been eſtabliſhed. We have already ſeen, that it ruins the Efficacy of the Grace of God, which he would convey to us in that Sacrament. Beſides that, we muſt remember, that our Lord Jeſus Chriſt did Inſtitute it to be an Image of his death; *As often as you ſhall eat of this Bread, and drink of this Cup, you ſhall ſhew forth the Lords death.* 1 Cor. 11. Now after the Remark of Monſieur *de Condom* himſelf, the lively and efficacious Repreſentation of the lively Death which our Lord ſuffered, is not found, but in that his *Fleſh* and his *Blood* are myſtically ſeparated. For indeed, a *Fleſh* cannot be living when it is ſeparated from its *Blood*, and for the fit Repreſentation of Jeſus, as dead, we muſt ſee his *Fleſh* and his *Blood* ſeparated. It is then very evident, that they which give the People but one Sign, which give the *Fleſh* and *Blood* Myſtically conjoyned, do not give in their Communion the lively and efficacious Repreſentation of the Violent Death which our Lord ſuffered.

It is further certain, that this Divine Sacrament hath been inſtituted as a Sacred Repaſt, that ſhould teach us in a Myſterious manner, that our Soul's ſhall find in the Lord Jeſus Chriſt compleat Nouriſh-

ment; therefore it hath been eſtabliſhed under the two Signs of *Bread* and *Wine*, which are ſufficient to nouriſh the Body; and that ſignifies, that the Grace of Jeſus Chriſt is ſufficient to nouriſh our Souls. But is it not evident, that in *Retranching the Cup they* ruine this excellent Myſtery? Can one live with *Bread* alone; can a Body be ſuſtain'd with Meat without Drink? And the Grace of Jeſus Chriſt, that makes our Souls to live, is it ſufficiently repreſented by a kind of Repaſt, with which one muſt neceſſarily die?

This Sacrament was alſo inſtituted to be a common Repaſt, a Feaſt of Society among many Brethren, for to nouriſh Charity and entertain the Union of the Faithful. Therefore the Ancients ſaid, that this Union was myſtically repreſented by the Union of many grains of *Wheat*, which compoſe one Loaf of Bread; and by that of many grains of *Raiſons*, which compoſe one Wine. It is then a Family Repaſt, this Sacrament; but where was there ever ſeen a Repaſt, where only Meat is given, and not Drink? Certainly, thoſe Hereticks which St. *Cyprian* condemns, becauſe they would uſe only *Water* in the Euchariſt, were leſs Cruel, and did leſs ruine the Myſteries of this Sacrament. For there, at leaſt in their *Euchariſt*, there was both Meat and Drink; and that is it which is eſſential to every Repaſt. Thenceforth therefore, let them talk no more of this, as of a buſineſs little important, which deſtroys the Sacrament of the *Euchariſt*, which ruins the Efficacy of it, and which oppoſes all the Ends for which it was inſtituted.

Epiſtol. ad Cæcil.

Monſieur *de Condom* hath put himſelf behind a Retranchment, wherein he conceives that we cannot force him. It is an old wrangle about one Article of our Diſcipline, which permits ſuch as have an invincible averſion

averſion for *Wine*, to Communicate under the ſole kind of *Bread*. This Example ſhews, that Monſieur *de Condom* is not very ambitious of ſpeaking always things that are novel and ſublime; for there is no Miſſionary ſo ſmall, that hath not treated this difficulty in the very duſt of Publick places, and that hath not declaim'd thereon from the very Stalks. Yet, now muſt we conſider it as having ſomewhat in it, ſeeing a Man of Merit and Weight would have it ſo. [*They have judged*, ſaith he, *by this Rule, that both Kinds were not Eſſential to Communion, by the Inſtitution of Jeſus Chriſt; otherwiſe they muſt have refuſed wholly the Sacrament to thoſe that could not receive it wholly entire.*] I wonder that theſe Gentlemen do not alſo argue againſt us, that we have diſpenſed Blind men from Reading God's Word, the Deaf from Hearing, and the Dumb from Singing the Praiſes of their Creatour. I always thought, that no Man was obliged to Impoſſibilities. To hear God's Word and implore his Name, are at leaſt as neceſſary to Salvation, as participation of Sacraments; yet the Deaf and the Dumb are diſpens'd, becauſe of Impoſſibility. *Expoſ.* pag. 176.

Our Diſcipline ſpeaks of Perſons which have an invincible Averſion for *Wine*, that can neither Smell nor Taſte it, and much leſs ſwallow it. We diſpenſe not thoſe Perſons from taking the *Wine*; it is Nature that diſpenſes them putting into them an inſuperable Obſtacle from the reception of *Wine*. It's not therefore We that give this Diſpenſation, nor that divide the Sacrament. To explain my ſelf more neatly I ſay there are two ſorts of Commands: Some are *Negative*, which ordain the abſtaining; ſuch as be the Prohibitions, for Example, of committing *Aaultery* or *Murther*, of falling into *Idolatry*. Some are *Affirmative*, which order us to do, for Example, *Giving of*

Alms, Viſiting the Sick, Comfort the Afflicted. The firſt ſort do always oblige, and in all Circumſtances; for it is never permitted to *commit Adultery*, to *Rob* or *commit Murther*: But the *Affirmatives* oblige not, but within certain Circumſtances, and under condition of Poſſibility. The Command of *partaking of the Sacrament of the Euchariſt*, is one of thoſe Commands Affirmative, which oblige not but in ſuch Occaſions wherein it is poſſible. A Man that hath no Goods, is diſpens'd from giving Alms. He that hath no Feet cannot Viſit the Sick: He that hath no Tongue, is diſpens'd from Comforting the Afflicted, Likewiſe, he that cannot abſolutely drink *Wine*, is diſpens'd by this abſolute Impoſſibility. Methinks, a Man muſt be blinded with his Prejudices beyond all that can be ſaid, to compare things ſo different, and to ſay, *We diſpenſe a particular Man among an hundred Thouſand, from taking the Cup, becauſe he cannot drink Wine; therefore it is permitted willingly, and without neceſſity, to take away the Cup from all Chriſtian People.*

I am ſenſible that thoſe Doctours will not be content herewith, and that they will ſay, *However tell us, if what this Man takes, that communicates with you under the Sign of* Bread, *without Wine, is a true Sacrament: If it be a true Sacrament, why ſhould not that be One which we preſent to our People?* I Anſwer, That what we offer to this Man is a true Sacrament, becauſe we offer him both the Signs; yea, we oblige him to take the Cup in his hand: And what the *Roman* Church preſents to their Communicants is not a true Sacrament, becauſe ſhe gives them nothing but *Bread*. But they will ſay, *What he receives among you, that cannot drink the Wine, is not a true Sacrament as to the Sign.* I Anſwer, That it is a true Sacrament, as to the Thing ſignified. *It* is certain, that to ſpeak exactly,

exactly, he doth not take with his Mouth the Sacrament of Jesus Christ; for this Sacrament is composed of Two parts, and he receives but One. But he receives Jesus Christ, signified by the Sacrament, and receives as much of Graces, as they that Communicate of the Sacrament it self. Why? Because the Sacrament is entirely presented to him, because he receives it in his desire and heart, and because only an insuperable Impossibility hinders him from communicating of the Sign. Suppose we, that a Man is found, which hath the same aversion for the *Bread* as for the *Wine*; that never was, it may be, found; but it is not impossible. This Man will come to the Lords Table, he will take with his hand the one and the other Sign, he'l bring them near to his Mouth; but he will return them, not being able to pass further. What doth that Man? Doth he take a true Sacrament? Not at all; he takes not the Sacrament, he receives the Spiritual things presented under the Sacrament, that is, *Grace*. But to what purpose doth he come near the Table, to receive nothing there? For he might have received Grace without stirring from home. He comes to make unto God a solemn Protestation, that his Impotency is the only cause that hinders him from partaking of the Signs; that he thirsts after his Grace, that he desires to have part in the efficacy of the Sacrament, and to shew to all the Faithful, that he doth not deprive himself of those Sacred Signs out of contempt of Religion. If those Doctours do not relish this Theology, I beseech them to hear *Epist.* 77. St *Bernard*, that tells them, *It is not Privation of the Sacrament that damns; but Contempt.* I conjure them to consult all the *Theologues* of their School, and examine what they say of *Baptism of Vow*, or the *Vow of Baptism*. There is none but saith, *That he who desires sincerely and ardently to*

receive Baptiſm, and dies without partaking of the Sign, doth nevertheleſs receive the Efficacy and all the Virtue of Baptiſm.

ARTICLE XIV.

Of Holy Scripture.

WE have upon this Article very important Controverſies with the *Roman* Church of the *Perfection of Scripture*, of its *Obſcurity*, of its *Authority*; alſo touching the *Utility* and *Neceſſity* of Reading the ſaid *Holy Scripture*, of the Soveraign Judge of Controverſies and of Traditions. Monſieur *de Condom* paſſes almoſt all theſe under Silence, and wraps it up in few Words; except the Queſtion of its Authority, which he Treats of a little more largely. I have no deſign neither, to make here large Common places upon theſe Controverſies. Volumes have been ſufficiently written, on both ſides, to compoſe great Libraries. I will only ſay, That all the dexterity of *Monſieur de Condom*, will never make us to paſs this for a thing of ſmall importance. We ſhall never reliſh, that any ſhould make it their Task to ſpeak ill of *Holy Scripture*. It is a wicked Character, and a bad Prejudice for theſe Doctours Cauſe. When Men ſpeak ill of their Judge, and that they ſeek for Means of Recuſation againſt him, it is a Proof, that they do not believe him favourable to their Intereſt. If the *Roman* Church believed the Scripture to be on their ſide, they would not ſeek out ſo many Means, to make her

her loſe her Credit with the People. It is a thing that could never be believed, if we did not ſee it, That Chriſtians ſhould buſie themſelves to prove, that the Book which includes the Doctrine that ſaves them from Hell, is an imperfect and mutilate Book, gnawed by the Teeth of Time, depraved and corrupted by the *Jews* and by the *Hereticks*; that it contains but a little part of the Doctrine of the Church; that they muſt add thereto the Help of Traditions: That it is an an-*Obſcure Book*, that Men cannot underſtand it without the help of the Church; that God hath filled it with Rocks and Shelfs, that proud Spirits might be wracked thereon: That it is a Leaden Rule, which Men turn what way they pleaſe; that *Hereticks* may eaſily abuſe it, to fight againſt the Truth; that we find not Light enough therein to diſſipate the Darkneſs of Errour; that it is a Labyrinth, wherein Men are neceſſarily loſt when they are not conducted; that it hath no Authority, in regard to us, without the Teſtimony of the Church; that it hath not Characters of *Divinity* ſufficient to prove it ſelf; that it cannot explain it ſelf by clear Places, of what it ſaith in obſcure Paſſages; that without the Authority of the Church, we ſhould be no more obliged to believe it to be Divine, than any other Book; that the Lecture of this Book is dangerous, that one muſt extreamly diſtinguiſh the Perſons, to whom the Reading thereof ſhould be permitted; that Verſions in the Vulgar Tongue cannot appear without peril; that the People ſhould not have liberty of handling theſe Sacred Books. They would have us to hear all theſe things patiently, and that we ſhould keep Silence thereat. But that cannot be: We ſhould be the moſt baſe, and the moſt ungrateful of all Men, if we ſhould abandon the Defence of a Book, to which alone we are beholding, next to God, for our Eternal Salvation.

They will not fail to tell us, that we are *Calumniators*, and they ſpeak not with that contempt of the *Holy Scripture*. They will bring us the Teſtimonies of ſome particular Perſons of the latter days, which have ſpoken of it with grand *Eloges* and *Praiſes*. And I could relate the Words of other particulars, and would bring an hundred for one, which ſpeak thereof in the Terms which I expreſſed juſt now. If Monſieur *de Cadeau*, Biſhop of *Graſs*; if the Gentlemen of *Port-Royal* have ſpoken of this *Scripture* with the Reſpect due thereto, that hath not been regarded as their fair ſide and beſt Character. And all the World knows the Violent Perſecutions whereto ſome have been expoſed, becauſe of that.

Monſieur *de Condom* may ſay what he pleaſes in favour of *Tradition*; but we maintain, That it is an opening of the Door to all the Corruptions of Doctrine and Worſhip. There is none ſo ſtrange and ſo oppoſite to the Spirit of *Chriſtianiſm*, that may not enter into the Church under this Name of *Tradition*. Sad Experience teaches us enough thereof. It is this Word that filled with *Images* the Temples of Chriſtians, to the great Scandal of thoſe who are jealous of the Purity of Worſhip. It is that which introduced into Religion the Service of *Creatures*, Invocation of *Saints*, the Worſhip of the *Holy Virgin*, *Pilgrimages*, Adoration of *Relicks*, and ſo many other ſuch like things. If the *Roman* Church were reduced to defend her ſelf only by Scripture, ſhe ſhould ſoon be driven to forſake the moſt part of her Worſhip and of her Devotions: But where *Scripture* fails her, *Tradition* is an obſcure Spring, entangled and Profound, which furniſhes with all that ſhe pleaſes. Methinks, it is very unjuſt to wrangle with People, and impoſe it for a Crime on them, that they will not believe but God alone, ſpeaking

ſpeaking in the *Scriptures*, and by the Pen of his *Prophets* and *Apoſtles*.

With what Juſtice would they have us to regard, as a ſmall buſineſs, that Enterprize, to have taken away the Word of God, in the Book thereof, from the hands of the People? Is not that a Capital Affair? Where ſhall Knowledge be drawn, if the Spring thereof be ſhut up? Where ſhall Men learn to know God aright, if they rob the People of that Book, where God himſelf makes himſelf known? When I ſee that they ſay with Confidence, *That it is not true, that they have forbidden the Lecture of the Word of God*, that diſmays me, and drives my Patience to the utmoſt. I know not how Men can contradict ſo a Publick Authority. It is true, that there are ſome in the *Roman* Church, which condemn that Prohibition made to the People of Reading the *Holy Scripture*; and I could wiſh no fairer Diſcourſe thereon, than what hath ſaid the Author of the *Dialogues* between the two Pariſhioners of Saint *Hilary du Mont*. But what was ſaid of thoſe Perſons? They ſay they have borrowed the Weapons of *Hereticks*, and have brightned them the more. [*They accuſe them to oppoſe the Sentiments of the Church; becauſe that the Church, conducted by Gods Spirit, permits not indifferently the Reading of Holy Scripture to all Perſons, without the Advice and Explication of Eccleſiaſtical Superiours, for fear leſt the Difficulty or Obſcurity of Underſtanding in ſome places, ſhould produce Scruples and Errours in Mens Spirits. It being certain, that all Hereſies, which are born in its boſom, have always their foundation and their defence in the Words of the Holy Scripture ill underſtood.*] It is the Lord Biſhop of *Ambrun*, who ſpeaks in his Ordinance againſt the Traduction of *Mons*. I think he knows what he ſaith; for

Father *Annat.*

for the leaſt thing that may be granted to an *Archbiſhop*, it is, that he ſhould know Religion. And indeed, doth not all the World know, that the Rules which are at the Head of the *Index Expurgatorius*, forbid the Lecture of the *Holy Word of God*; excepting thoſe who ſhall have permiſſion from their Ordinary, of the Curate or the Confeſſor? It is not a Decree of the Council of *Trent*, will they ſay: No, but it is the Spirit of the Council. They are *Theologians*, deputed by the Council of *Trent*, that ſpeak it. It is Pope *Pius* the Fourth, who preſided in that Council, and who poſſeſſed the Spirit thereof. *Sixtus* the Fifth, and *Clement* the Eighth, Succeſſours of *Pius* the Fourth, ought to have had the Spirit of the Church. Methinks it is they that ſay, *That by the Command, and Uſe of the Holy Inquiſition* Romaine Univerſella, *the Power of permitting the reading or retaining the Bible in the Vulgar Tongue, both of the Old and of the New Teſtament, hath been taken away from Biſhops, Inquiſitors, or Superiours of the Regulars.* Let Men but read the laſt Writings, which have been made thereabout, upon the occaſion of the Verſion of *Mons*; the Ordinances of my Lords of *Paris* and of *Ambrun*; the Writings of Father *Annat*, and all the Apologies which have been made for the Defence of thoſe Pieces; and Men ſhall ſee whether it be true, *That the Reading of Scripture be permitted and ordained to all the World.* I muſt remit thoſe, that will be inſtructed in this Matter, to the Book of Monſieur *Mallet*, where Men ſhall ſee the *Councils*, *Popes*, *Cardinals*, *Biſhops*, *Faculties of Theology*, and the *Theologues* agreeing in this Article. It is, *That the Reading of the Word of God is dangerous, when it is permitted to all the World.* But, is there need of Proofs for a thing that is ſeen? Where is there a Reading of the Word of God; in favour of the People?

People? Is it in the Church? If they Read any part thereof, it is in a ſtrange Tongue; it is no more for Inſtruction; *It is for Prayer*, as ſaid a *Franciſcan* in the Council of *Trent*: Is it in Private Houſes? But in what Country doth the People know the *Word of God* of himſelf? Certainly, in *Spain* and in *Italy*, the *Bible* is that of all Books that the People knows leaſt of. In *France*, ſome honeſt Perſons read it; but their Number is very ſmall. It is not charged as a Duty upon any Perſon; happily there are not of a Thouſand, One that hath caſt his Eyes upon this Sacred Book. Thence comes the profound Ignorance of moſt People, even of thoſe who diſtinguiſh themſelves by their quality, or by their Character. We muſt not flatter our ſelves; We ſhall never regard that Conduct as coming from the Spirit of God, and we ſhall never re-enter into a Church, which treats *Holy Scripture* with ſo much Injuſtice.

ARTI-

ARTICLE XV.

Of the Church.

AS for the Authority of the *Church*, it cannot be an Affair of little Importance, ſeeing the Queſtion is, whether the Tribunal of it ſhall be lifted up above the *Holy Scripture*. Monſieur *de Condom* cannot be ignorant, that this Controverſie of the *Infallible Authority of the Church*, is an Article ſo Capital, that thereon depends all the Re-union whereto they invite us. Whilſt that the *Roman* Church ſhall call it ſelf *Infallible*, ſhe will ſhut the Door againſt all Reformation; and as long as ſhe ſhall refuſe all Reformation, ſhe cannot hope that we ſhall return into her Boſom. This Doctrine of *Infallibility* is the moſt dangerous that could ever enter into the Church; becauſe it opens the way to all ſorts of Errours and Superſtitions, and takes away all liberty of Examining thoſe things, which Uſe or Authority have once eſtabliſhed. A Church that calls her ſelf *Infallible* boldly, eſtabliſhes boldly what ſhe wills, and what may be found uſeful for its Intereſt. And after that, there is no more any Means to return. We muſt alſo be permitted to ſay, That this is an Affair of the higheſt Importance, ſeeing the Foundation of the Faith of our People depends thereon. They would not have us to eſtabliſh it on the *Holy Scripture*, which is the Stay and Pillar of Truth; and they would have us to knowledge all that we muſt believe, as from the Church, without being able to tell us which is this Church, and where are the Titles of its *Infallibility*. Theſe Gentlemen do thruſt us very hardly upon the

Authority

Authority of *Scripture*, the diverſity of its Senſes upon the liberty whereof they accuſe us, as given to Women and to Artificers, to interpret it after their manner, and to make themſelves a new Religion, if it ſeems good to them. But I know not how they mind not, that with all their Maxims of Submiſſion and blind Obedience, for their Interpretations of the Church, they muſt caſt the Faith of their People into an incertitude, greater a thouſand times, than that wherein they ſay that we are. *It is the Church*, ſay they, *to whoſe Interpretations we muſt cleave.* I will; but let them ſhew me that Church to whom I muſt ſubmit. I ſee in the *Orient* a *Greek* Church, which they call *Schiſmatick*; in the *Occident*, I ſee there Societies of Men, whom they call *Eutychians*, *Jacobites*, *Neſtorians*, *Melchites*, and many others. Each one of theſe Societies tells me, that ſhe is the true Church, whom I muſt hear. Which ſhall I believe? *Believe her*, ſay they, *that hath the Marks of Antiquity, of Succeſſion of Chairs, and particularly of the Apoſtolick Chair.* But every one of thoſe Societies doth boaſt to have all thoſe Advantages, to be the moſt Ancient, to be Apoſtolical; to have had the *Apoſtles* for Founders. The Church of *Alexandria* ſaith, that ſhe was founded by St. *Mark*, her firſt Biſhop; that of *Jeruſalem*, by St. *James*.

Theſe are Matters of Fact, and to clear my ſelf thereof, I muſt read whole Libraries: I that neither have *Latin* nor *Greek*, which have neither time enough, nor piercing Wits to follow hard Studies. Either I muſt remain uncertain, or elſe I ſhall be reduced to believe, that the *Roman* Church is the true Church, upon her own ſimple Word, and upon the Witneſs that ſhe gives her ſelf, which is of all things in the World the moſt unjuſt; for no Man ought to be believed in his own Cauſe. Yea, though I ſhould believe,

that

that the *Roman* Church is the true Church, and Infallible. If I ask where that *Infallible* doth reſt, they cannot teach it me. The one will ſay, that it is in the *Pope*; others will ſay, that it is falſe, and I muſt beware of that thought. Some Doctours will tell me, that the *Infallible Oracle* is not found but in Councils; but others will call that Opinion, *Hereſie*, and will Threaten the Tribunal of the *Inquiſition*, if I yield unto thoſe Thoughts. I know not then what ſide to turn to, to find a ſolid Prop to my Faith; for on all hands I ſee nothing but Doubts, in that which they call the *Church*, uncertainty, and dividing of Opinions. If I pierce into the bottom of that Church, and that I examine the Senſe thereof, I ſee People that ſay with one Voice, *We muſt follow the Church; One cannot go off from her without wandring.* But under that appearance of Uniformity, I ſee a prodigious diverſity of Opinions: Some are *Semi-Pelagians*, and teach, *That Grace is not efficacious, but by the Will of Man*; others defend *Efficacious Grace* by itſelf, and accuſe the former of recalling *Pelagianiſm*. Some ſay, *That the Command of Loving God obliges at all times*; and the others ſay, that *it never obliges*. I ſee ſome that accuſe others to be the *Corrupters of Morality*, and which indeed make the Truth of their Accuſation palpable by ones Finger; but they who are accuſed, do by turns accuſe their Adverſaries to be *Calviniſts*, *Hereticks*, to ruine the Virtues of Sacraments; to eſtrange the Faithful from the Communion of the Body of Chriſt, and to bind *Conſcience* by unjuſt Chains. All thoſe People are in the Church; they follow all the Sentiments of the Church, as they ſay; yet are they in Paths ſo oppoſite, that *Hell* and *Heaven* are not more. See the Uniformity of that Church, whereto they would have me to give up my ſelf. It muſt be a concluded Affair:

We

We ſhall never reſolve to leave the Foundation of the Word of God, who always abides the ſame, to engage our Selves in a Sea of Doubts and Uncertainties, where we cannot ſet our Foot, nor find a fixed Bottom. That the important Controverſie of Authority *Infallible* of the Church, be not an Obſtacle to our Reunion.

Monſieur *de Condom* would perſwade us, by all means, that we are, in that regard, in the ſame Practiſe, and in the ſame Opinion with his Church. In that we make our Church *Judge Soveraign* and *Infallible* of the Controverſies which ariſe among us. He proves it by two things: Firſt, Becauſe we condemn the Doctrine of the *Independants*, which ſay, *That every Faithful Man is to follow the Motions of his own Conſcience, and that each Flock is to be governed by their proper Laws, without dependance of any other, in Matters Eccleſiaſtical.* Whereto we oppoſe, That if that Doctrine had place, there might be formed as many Religions as Pariſhes; and we conclude, That the Faithful ought to be Dependants in regard of their Faith; that is, they muſt depend upon a Superiour Authority, which is that of the *Church*. I conceive not what difficulty Monſieur *de Condom* finds therein. Have we ever ſaid, That the Faithful ought to be abſolutely Independant of the Church? Do we deny the Authority of the Church to be great, holy, venerable? Do we conſider the Deciſions of holy *Councils* Aſſembled in God's Name, and who have decreed according to his Word, as Nothing? There is much difference between a *Great Authority*, and an *Infallible Authority*; between a blind and abſolute Dependance, and a Dependance conditional. The Authority of the Church is great, but it is not Infallible. *Councils* ought not to be deſpiſed; but their Deciſions are not to be received blindfold. The Faithful are to

live

live in Dependance; but they muſt examine by the Word of God thoſe Deciſions, whereon they are to depend. Not to make a New Religion, if they think good; but to ſubmit to Deciſions by a Principle of Reaſon, lightned with Divine Faith, and grounded on the Word of God. But they will ſay, *If thoſe Private Men in their* Examen, *Judge, that the Deciſion of the Church be not true, what muſt they do? Ought they to ſubmit or no? If they ſubmit againſt the Judgment of their Reaſon, that is it we ask. If they ſubmit not, and that they follow their Thoughts, there is a new Religion.* I Anſwer, If thoſe Private Men Judge, that the Deciſion of a Council be falſe, they cannot but follow the Judgmenr of their Heart, although all the Popes and Biſhops ſhould oppoſe it; but if they be wiſe, they will not ſtick to their firſt Examination; they will labour to have their Doubts clear'd. If they cannot, they will keep ſilence, in caſe the Errour in hand be not Capital. If they believe that their Salvation is concerned, then their Conſciences obliges them, not to make a New Religion, but to chuſe that which they believe moſt conformed to the Truth of the Goſpel. I will not engage further into a Queſtion which hath a long Train; One may read thereon thoſe who have Written to juſtifie our Separation, and among others, the excellent Anſwer of Monſieur *Claude*, in his Book of *Prejudices*; there may all ſee, what are the Rights of Private Men, and of Flocks, when the Church begins to wander.

The other Proof which Monſieur *de Condom* brings to prove, *That we give to our Synods an Infallible Authority*, is drawn from our Diſcipline. That Diſcipline would have, that when a Point of Doctrine is in Controverſie, after that the buſineſs hath paſſed the Judgment of the *Conſiſtory*, of the *Colloques*, and of *Synods Provincial*. In fine, They ſhould acquieſce in the

the Judgment of the *Synod National.* The ſame Diſcipline Ordains, That in the Letters of *Miſſion*, whereof the Churches do charge the Deputies, which go to Synods, there be a Clauſe of Submiſſion in theſe Terms, [*We promiſe before God, to ſubmit to all that ſhall be concluded and reſolved in your holy Aſſembly, being perſwaded, that God will preſide by his Spirit, &c.*] To that Monſieur *de Condom* adds a Fact drawn from the Synod of *Saint Foy*, *Anno* 1578. where ſome Overtures were made of Reconciliation with the *Lutherans*, and deputed Four Men, to whom was given an Abſolute Power to terminate that Affair as ſhould ſeem good to them. *Behold*, ſay they, *where ends the falſe delicateneſs of theſe Gentlemen! They will not receive the Deciſions of Councils; they make no difficulty to put their Faith into the hands of Four Men; who would be weary to be obliged to anſwer ſo many things that come to nothing.* What doth all that, I pray you? Doth that prove, that we hold the *Church* for an Infallible Judge? All that Monſieur *de Condom* ſays, returns to this Reaſoning, or it returns to nothing.

Thoſe who give their Synods power to judge Soveraignly of Points of Faith, who promiſe Submiſſion in the aſſurance that the Holy Ghoſt preſides there; and who retrench from the Communion of the Church thoſe that would not ſubmit to their Deciſion, give to theſe Synods an Infallible Authority; but the *Calviniſts* do that; therefore they give to to their Synods an *Infallible Authority.* This Argument ſuppoſes falſe, and concludes ill.

1. It ſuppoſes falſe; for it is not true that we promit our Synods a blind Submiſſion. What is ſaid to them, *That we are perſwaded, that God will preſide in the midſt of them by his Spirit*, is a Clauſe of Civility, whereof the Terms are not to be abuſed. That ſignifies

ſignifies nothing, but that we wiſh and hope, that the *Holy Ghoſt* will direct them. It is not true neither, that the Synod of *Sainte Foy* have put the Faith of the Proteſtant Churches of *France*, *in depoſito*, into the hands of Four Men; for what was committed to them was not to make new Articles of Faith, but only to compoſe a Formulary in general Terms, which all the World might receive. And they did not ſo far refer themſelves wholly to their Judgment, but that they reſerved liberty not to follow them, if they ſhould chance to make ſome falſe Advance.

2. This Argument concludes ill; for, from what Power we give to our Synods to Judge of the Points of Doctrine, and do cut off thoſe that will not ſubmit to their Judgment, Monſieur *de Condom* concludes, that we attribute to them an *Infallible Authority*. This Reaſoning is worth nothing, or this is good. The *Biſhops* and *Archbiſhops* do give Ordinances; Councils *Provincial* and *National* in the *Roman* Church, decide Points of Faith, and cut off thoſe that will not ſubmit; therefore they believe themſelves *Infallible*. I do not therefore think that the Biſhops, neither ſeparately nor in their whole Body, out of a General Council, eſteem themſelves *Infallible*. Muſt then the Priviledge of *Infallibility* be had, to have the Power to Judge of a Point of Faith? There would then be none, but the Pope or the Council that could Judge thereof.

There muſt be an Order. Every Society is in right of Judging of Controverſies which ariſe in its boſom, and that Member thereof that will not ſubmit to that Judgment, may be caſt out of the Body. Therefore we do properly complain, That the *Roman* Church having pronounc'd againſt us in the Council of *Trent*, after that did caſt us out of their Body; They uſed in that the right which appertains to every Society; but

but we complain, that they have unjuſtly condemned us. The Queſtion touching the Rights and Authorities of *Councils* and *Synods* deſerves an *Examen* much more ample; we will leave it as an Incident which Monſieur *de Condom* hath brought into his Book, without neceſſity, and only to entangle the ſtate of the Queſtion. It imports nothing at the bottom, what Authority *Synods* may have, to know whether the *Roman* Religion is far diſtant from the *Proteſtant*, which is properly the Affair here in agitation.

ARTICLE XVI.

Of the POPE, *and of his Authority.*

I Follow the Order of Monſieur *de Condom*; I finiſh by the Head of that great Body into which they would have us re-enter, that is, the *Pope*. Here alſo, after him, a Point whereof we have made a ſtumbling Block without any reaſon. What is the *Pope?* It is the Principle of Unity, the Cement of Union: It's a Head whereto all the Members have a relation, and who makes the Uniting of the Church; for Men know there is no Goverment more ſolid, and that contributes more to the Conſervation of States, than the Monarchical. What hurt then can there be to ſet upon the Body of the Church a Spiritual Monarch, a Viſible Head, that may watch for its Conſervation and may govern it? Muſt not People be very Captious, to make of that a cauſe of Separation?

I will regard well this Article at firſt, under the ſame face that Monſicur of *Condom* doth. The *Pope* is a Viſible Head, a Spiritual Monarch; but who hath appointed this Monarch? Is it poſſible that Men do not feel, that this puts a prodigious difference between the Religion of *Proteſtants* and the *Roman* Religion. To make it appear, I ſuppoſe, that the Lord Jeſus Chriſt would have the Government of his Church ſhould be *Ariſtocratical*, and that he hath put it into the hands of ſuch whom he hath called *Biſhops* and *Prieſts*, whom he hath inveſted with equal Power. I know well that this Principle is conteſted; but once more, I am not oblig'd to prove any thing in this Work. I am permitted to ſuppoſe my Principles, and in ſuppoſing them, I muſt ſhew how they are incompatible with thoſe of that Church whereunto they would have us return. If then the Lord Jeſus Chriſt hath ſetled a Government *Ariſtocratick* in his Church, this kind of Government is of Divine Right; and if it be of Divine Right, none muſt be permitted to change it under whatſoever pretence. The kind of Government is ſo much of the Eſſence of a State, That the State changes abſolutely, loſes its Name and its Form, when the Government is changed. All the World knows, that a Kingdom, which by a general Revolt ſhakes off the Yoke of its legal Maſter, and then a Popular Government, a Republick, which by the violence of an Uſurper becomes a Monarchy, are no more what they were before; and they would, that without ruining the Church, they may make a *Monarchy* thereof, againſt the intention and deſign of Jeſus Chriſt. We do not underſtand that.

Suppoſe

Suppoſe we alſo, that this Soveraign Power, exerciſed at *Rome*, be an Uſurped Power. It is the Principle of Proteſtants, *Selon ce Principe*, is it poſſible that they would oblige us to ſubmit to an Uſurped Power? If a Tyrant or Rebel had taken the place of the Legal Prince; were it not extream baſeneſs, and a Crime of High Treaſon to acknowledge this Uſurper? We muſt then be perſwaded, that this Authority, which they call, *Of the Holy Siege*, is legitimate, before that it can be honeſtly done, to ſollicite us to ſubmit thereto.

There hath been a time wherein God had charged himſelf with the Care of Governing immediately the Common-wealth of the *Hebrews* by Prophets and inſpired Judges, whom he ſent to them. If any, during that time, had undertaken, without a Call, to make himſelf Monarch of that People; is it not true, that by this attempt the Uſurper had made himſelf guilty, leſs againſt the Nation whereof he would oppreſs the Liberty than againſt God, upon whoſe Rights he had undertaken? That People, though inclined to Revolt, durſt not make them a King; they ask one of God. If that Nation had otherwiſe uſed it, it is certain, it had been Criminal before God as much as may be.

If we will conſider this Reflexion, we ſhall ſee that *Proteſtants* in their Principles, muſt regard, as guilty of the higheſt Enterprize againſt the Rights of God, Him, that without Call, hath made himſelf the Head of this Church; and it will be granted, that without the greateſt baſeneſs, they cannot ſubmit to that Prince who hath ſeized upon God's Rights without his permiſſion. In fine, It is impoſſible that Proteſtants ſhould regard as Indifferent, or as Tolerable in Chriſtian Religion, a Dignity which is abſolutely oppoſite to the Spirit of *Chriſtianiſm*. This Spirit is *Humility*,

Humility, Poverty, Deſpiſing the World, Obedience, Renouncing all kind of Pomp, Grandeur, and Vanity. After that they would have us to regard, as Prince Spiritual of the Chriſtian World, a Man that is Crowned with all the Pomp of the Kings of the Earth; that makes his *Feet* to be kiſſed by the Perſons of the greateſt Quality; that is carried on Mens Shoulders, and who carries the Rights of *Soveraignty*, and the Characters of *Puiſſance*, beyond what was ever imagined.

But after having conſidered the *Pope* is the Theology of Politicians, who keep within general Terms; why ſhould it not be lawful to us, to regard him in an *Italian* Theology? See what it is in this *Italian* Theology, *It is a Man that cannot be* Diſt. 96. *tied nor untied by a Regular Power*; who was called God, by *Conſtantine*. Now it is manifeſt that God cannot be judged by Men. *It is a Man, whoſe Faults cannot be* Diſt. 40. *admoniſhed on Earth, though he ſhould be known to neglect his own Salvation, and that of his Brethren; uſeleſs and relaxed in his Works, ſilencing the Good, and leading with himſelf Crowds of Men to the firſt ſlavery of Hell; becauſe being ſetled to judge all the reſt, He may* Barn. Rom. Eccleſ. lib. 1. §. 5. 13. *not be judged of any. It is a Man, whom none of the Councils lawfully Aſſembled durſt ever judge; becauſe he is the Judge of all.* On the contrary, Councils have often cried, *The firſt Seat is Judged of none*; and they ſay to the Pope, *Judge your ſelf, Juſtifie or Condem your ſelf. It is a Man,* Bellar. min. contra Gerſon. *whereof the* Roman *Ceremonial ſaith, That as oft as the Emperour ſeeth him, he ought to ſalute him, bare his Head, and kneel to him; approach his Throne, kiſs his*

his Feet devoutly, hold his Stirrup till he be got up, then takes his Horſe by the Bridle and leads him ſome Paces. And in whatever Town, where the Pope is to be carried in a Chair, the Prince of the place, though he were a King, muſt carry the Chair ſome ſteps, with the greateſt Lords of the Country. It is a Man, that can do all what is needful to lead Souls to Paradiſe, and may take away all Obſtacles, which the World and the Devil, with all their Strength and Craft, can oppoſe. It is a Man, that can ſuffer the Title of Vice-God, *as* Paul *the Fifth, in the beginning of this Age. They made Pictures and Dedications with this Inſcription, Paulo* Quinto Vice-Deo, &c. *Moſt Invincible of the Chriſtian Republick,* &c. It is a Man of whom the *Canoniſts* ſay, *Reſtituit Papa ſolus, deponit & ipſe, Dividit ac unit, eximit atque probat, Articulos ſolvit, Synodumque facit Generalem, transfert & mutat, appellat nullus ab illo.* That is to ſay, *That he alone ſettles, depoſes, divides, unites, condemns, approves, breaks Articles, makes Councils, tranſports, and changes according to his good pleaſure without appeal. It is a Man that gives Realms at his Will, looſens Subjects from their Oath made to their Prince, who is Maſter of the Temporal of Kings. It is a Man, who alone poſſeſſes the Priviledge of* Infallibility, *and who is the only Oracle of the Church. It is a Man, that can diſpenſe againſt Laws Divine and Human; and according to the plenitude of his Power, diſpences above Right and Law, diſpences againſt Apoſtles and their Canons; againſt the Old Teſtament, about* Tithes, Vows, *and* Oaths. *It is a Man, whom they ſet upon the Altar, when he is Choſen, and then to go to Adoration. It is a Man, that can ſuffer to be told in a full Council, Do ſo, that we may never loſe*

Concil. Lateran. 5. §. 4.

§. 7.

the Spirit, Life, and Salvation, which thou haſt given us. Thou art the Paſtour, the Phyſician, the Pilot, the Patron: Thou art, in fine, God on Earth. It is a Man that likes it well, that in the ſame Council they ſhould apply to him theſe Words of *Pſalm* 72. *Æthiopians ſhall come*, &c. *his Enemies ſhall lick the duſt; all Kings ſhall adore him, all Nations ſhall ſerve him.* It is there alſo where they ſtiled him, *The Divine Majeſty.* In fine, He is a Man that likes to be called, *Lord of Lords; Moſt Prudent, Moſt Wiſe, Adored of all Men.* If this Power be not lawful, why would they have us to ſubmit thereto? How could that agree with our Principles?

§. 9. Concil. *Later.* 3.

Theſe are happily the things which Monſieur *de Condom* means, and whereof he ſaith, That Miniſters ceaſe not to relate them, to render that Power odious. *You know well*, ſay they, *that this* Italian *Theology is ſlighted: They do not Canonize in* France *the Exceſs of the* Canoniſts; *contrarily they are condemned: And you cannot be ignorant, that the* Gallican *Church hath ſtill oppoſed them.* I grant it, if they pleaſe: Why then, would they that I ſhould regard the Pope, under the *Idea* which the *Gallican* Church forms, rather than under that which the *Roman* Church? I always heard ſay, *That to know a Subject, we muſt not regard him in the Opinion which certain Perſons have of him; but in himſelf, in that which he ſaith of himſelf, and what he doth.* Now it is certain, that the Pope is in himſelf what the *Canoniſts* have made him; and that he thinks of himſelf what the *Canoniſts* have ſaid; for it is he that hath cauſed thoſe *Canoniſts* to write: It is the Canon Law of the *Roman* Church, approved generally by the Court of *Rome*, and according to which

which they rule their Conduct. The *Gallican* Church may do what they please; the *Pope* doth still keep himself in the possession of Excommunicating Kings, dispensing their Subjects to the Oath of *Fidelity*, of transporting their Kingdoms to others, and exercising in general, all Actions of that Power which is attributed to him by the Canon Law. It is clear then, I must regard the *Pope*, not by what the *French* say of him, but in what he is, and what he doth. Men may say, that a thing should be *white*, when it is *black*, and blacks others that change nothing therein.

Besides that, I see not why they could not regard him in *France*, under the Character they give him in *France* it self. The Council of *Lateran*, wherein the *Pope* was called, *The Divine Majesty, Vice-God, King of Kings*, puts himself above all Councils, is printed in *France* with the Kings Priviledge, under the direction of the Fathers *Labbé* and *Cossart*, without any Correctiff. Can *France* have lost the Memory of that terrible *Harangue*, which was made in the grand Convention of the States 1615. by Cardinal *Perron*, in the Name of all the Clergy of the Kingdom? They would have passed an Ordinance, in those States, *That no Subject, under any Pretence, could be dispensed from the Oath of Fidelity*. The *Gallican* Church, by the Mouth of a *French* Cardinal, opposed it, and attributed to the *Pope* all that excess of Power that frights us: How after that can any Man boast of the Sense of the *Gallican Church*?

But happily, pretend they; *That* Innocent *the Eleventh, who holds now the Seat, hath renounced to all those Pretences that so offend us, and hath reduced himself to the Moderation of the* Gallican *Church, because he approves by a Brief Monsieur* de Condom's *Book; and that Book of Monsieur* de Condom *saith,*

That there are things, whereof they Diſpute in the Schools, which the Miniſters ceaſe not to alledge, to render that Puiſſance odious; but that it is not neceſſary to ſpeak thereof, ſeeing they are not of the Catholick Faith. In Conſcience can Men believe, that the Court of *Rome*, by the touch of a Pen, and without being either forc'd or ſollicited, had renounced all her magnificent Pretences, to all thoſe Priviledges, which they have acquired by the effuſion of ſo much Blood, and for which they were like to have overthrown all during the Sitting of the Council of *Trent*, in the fear they had, that it was intended to have a ſtroak at them. Theſe Diſputes of the Schools, in the Senſe of the Court of *Rome*, are but the Nice Trifles wherein Canoniſts agree not; although in the ſight of my Lord of *Condom*, they are poſſibly what we regard as Capital. Men know how to find a commodious Senſe in Terms more difficult to turns; and the Court of *Rome* finds enough to ſatisfie themſelves in theſe Words of Monſieur *de Condom*, [*That Men ought to render to the Pope, the Submiſſion and Obedience which the Holy Councils have always taught the Faithful.*] The two laſt of thoſe Holy Councils, are the Fifth of *Lateran*, which is Counted General; and that of *Trent*, for which my Lord of *Condom* hath ſo great a reſpect. Thoſe two Councils carry the Popes Authority, as far as it can go, at leaſt it will not be a Diſpute of Schools, to know whether they may call the Pope, *Our holy Lord*; for the Council of *Trent* ſeldom calls him otherwiſe; although the Apoſtles have not called the Son of God, but *Our Lord* ſimply. It muſt neither be a Diſpute of the Schools, to know, whether the Pope be Superiour to the Council; for the Council of *Trent* ſubmitted ſo fully to him, that they did nothing without *his* Order; and ſeeing they propoſed nothing but by

Expoſ. 209.

by the Pope, *Proponentibus legatis*; ſince it declared not to pretend to touch the Authority of the *Holy See*, nor ſubmit him to their Canons; and ſince it demanded from the Pope, the Confirmation of all their Decrees; and indeed, the *Pope* is at this day ſo far Maſter of this Council, that he Diſpenſes againſt all their Canons. After all this, how can they invite us to re-enter into the *Roman* Church, whilſt ſuch a Power ſhall ſubſiſt? We that pretend, That the Power of Paſtours is a *Pure Miniſtry*? We that believe, That Jeſus Chriſt hath not left them any *Juriſdiction on Conſciences*? We that acknowledge no other Univerſal Head of the Church, but *Jeſus Chriſt*? We that believe, That *Humility* is of the Eſſence of the Miniſtry Evangelical? We that aſcribe no *Adoration* nor *Divine Majeſty*, but to GOD?

ARTICLE XVII.

Of the Points which Monſieur de Condom *hath forgotten; Of the Worſhip in an Unknown Tongue; Of the Multitude of Ceremonies; Of Maſſes without Communicants; Of forced Celibat.*

I Do heartily conſent to what Monſieur *de Condom* wiſhes, to lay apart divers Queſtions, that we regard not as a lawful Subject of Rupture; but we cannot advance our Complaiſance ſo far, as to confeſs all that he hath left, and whereof he hath not ſpoken, be of this Number. I could add divers Points, which are moſt Eſſential, and which Juſtifie our Separation; but I confine my ſelf to Four, that I may not be accuſed, to make Subjects of Separation where there are none.

I. The Firſt is the Neceſſity which the *Roman* Church hath impoſed on her ſelf, to have their Service in the *Latin Tongue*, which is not underſtood of the People. I know not why Monſieur *de Condom* doth not take away the Scruples that we could have thereon; but we are obliged in Conſcience to adverize them, that *that* alone would be capable of hindring us from re-entring into the *Roman* Church, though there were nothing elſe to ſtay us; becauſe that nothing is more oppoſed to the Intention of Jeſus Chriſt, who hath inſtituted his Service with purpoſe, that his People might be Edified thereby. Although they

they could ſay the beſt and holieſt things in the World, that could ſerve for nothing; ſeeing that the Spirit and the Heart, that could not underſtand them, could not be edified thereby.

II. The Second thing which Monſieur *de Condom* hath forgotten, is the multitude of *Ceremonies*; and it is an Article that we cannot paſs any more than the others, that makes an Eſſential difference between Religions. *Judaiſm* and *Chriſtianiſm* differ Eſſentially, and only by that, they call us to another Yoke like to that of the *Jewiſh* Church. We do not believe we can ſuffer it with a good Conſcience, I have conſidered thoſe *Ceremonies* as oppoſed to the true Service of God; becauſe the moſt are deſtined to honour *Saints, Images, Relicks*, the *Sacrament of the Euchariſt*, and other Creatures. At preſent I conſider only their Number and their Uſeleſneſs; and under that regard, I maintain, that they are abſolutely oppoſed to the Spirit of *Chriſtianiſm*.

We muſt not imagine, that it is but a ſmall ill to be uſeleſs in matter of Religion. The Goſpel condemns to the Fire the *Uſeleſs Servant*, and puniſhes with Eternal Pains *Unfruitful Works*. Let them not ſay, That at the moſt thoſe Ceremonies are Uſeleſs. That which doth not ſerve in Religion doth much hurt. Thoſe *Ceremonies* are not come from a good place, for the moſt have been borrowed or imitated from thoſe Religions, with whom Chriſtian Religion ſhould in honour have nothing Common. They have been introduced under the Pretence of *Helping Devotion*, and we find on the contrary, that faſtning our Spirit to the Bark of *Religion*, it hinders him from piercing into its Internals. The Hearts and Spirits of the Vulgar, are but of a ſmall Capacity. When they are filled with thoſe Multitudes of *Ceremonies*, true Piety finds

finds no more place. The People ſee Churches magnificently Adorn'd, *Images*, *Statues*, *Prieſts* that celebrate Myſteries with great Pomp; they ſee a Worſhip compoſed of a great number of Myſtical Actions, whereof they know neither ſignification, nor end; and all that covered with the Veil of a *Strange Tongue*. This Compoſure of *Ceremonies*, which hath a great Air of Magnificence, ſurprizes the Senſes, ſtrikes the Imagination, dazles their feeble Lights, occupies the Capacities of their hearts, and fills them with an odd kind of Admiration, and of a confuſed Veneration, meerly Corporal and Mechanical, whereby they believe they do ſatisfie their Duty abundantly.

The more Superficies that a Body hath, the leſs Solidity. *Ceremonies* are the Superficies of Religion, and it is certain that they produce a Superficial Piety. For the moſt, they that are the worſt Chriſtians, are they that do moſt give up themſelves to theſe Appearances, and who are the moſt exact in the Obſervations of theſe *Ceremonies*. So may one ſay truly, that they compoſe a Veil and a Refuge for *Hypocriſie*. An Hypocrite, that will not ſubmit to that Obedience which God demands, and that will not renounce ſuch a Crime, is content to pay God with *Ceremonies*: He eſſays to ſatisfie his Conſcience therewithal, and perſwades himſelf, that God ſhould be contented therewith.

This affected Magnificence is unworthy the Grandeur and Majeſty of Religion. Her Myſteries are too beautiful to be hid, and this great Apparel of *Ceremonies* is not, as they believe, a Garment for her Ornaments, but it is a pompous Tomb, wherein ſhe lies buried. There is no need of placing Myſteries in Habits, in Geſtures, and in Viſible Actions; *Religion* hath Myſteries abundantly ſufficient to fill the Heart.

and

and occupy the Spirit. The *Perfection of Religion*, conſiſts in expoſing the Native Beauties of her Myſteries to the clear ſight of Men. Therefore the moſt perfect of *Religions* is that of the Bleſſed Souls, that ſee all Myſteries without Veils. The leaſt perfect of *Religions* was that of *Moſes*, which did cover all her Myſteries under the Shadows of her *Ceremonies*. It's plain, that *Chriſtian Religion* holds the Middle between the Religion of the *glorified Saints*, which hath no Ceremonies; and that of the *Jews*, which was wholly made up of them. Therefore ſhe muſt have ſome Ceremonies, which are the *Sacraments*; but ſhe muſt have but few; and to load her therewith, is to bring back *Judaiſm*.

In fine, We have a juſt Reaſon to refuſe all Reconciliation with the Multitude of thoſe *Ceremonies*; they have produced part of thoſe Evils whereof we complain at this day. There are ſome of them which were introduced in the beginning, without any ill Intention; but afterwards they have thence drawn Conſequences which have ruined the Truth. In the Firſt Ages, there was nothing more ſimple than the Celebration of the *Euchariſt*. *Juſtin Martyr* tells us, *That they took Wine, that they mixed it with Water, that they Bleſſed it together with the Bread, and that they diſtributed it to the Aſſiſtants by the hands of the Deacons.* But the ill underſtood Devotion of the following Ages, did ſwell up this Sacrament with great Numbers of *Ceremonies*. They that followed after, in thoſe Ages of *Ignorance*, did judge, that the *Body* of Jeſus Chriſt was at leaſt really under them, ſeeing they did celebrate this Myſtery with ſo much Pomp. And in fine, Finding in the Sacrament all the Ceremonies of a *Sacrifice*; it became eaſie to them to fall into the Conceit, that indeed it is a *Propitiatory Sacrifice*. This is a part of the Reaſons which make

us

us to regard this great Heap of *Ceremonies*, as a Worſhip wherein we never ought to Communicate.

III. Monſieur *de Condom*, in the Matter of the *Euchariſt* and of the *Sacrifice of the Maſs*, hath not ſaid one word of *Maſſes without Communicants*; I know not why; for he could not be ignorant, that we regard that as a great Affair. Indeed one cannot imagine a greater Metamorphoſis, than that which they have introduced thereby into the Sacrament of the *Euchariſt*. It is certainly clear, by the Hiſtory of the *Inſtitution*, and by the 11*th* Chapter of the firſt Epiſtle of St. *Paul* to the *Corinthians*, that the Lord had given this Sacrament to be a Repaſt of *Union* and *Charity*, wherein all the *Faithful* were to have their part. Every one ought to *Eat* and *Drink* therein, in memory of the *Benefit of the Death of his Saviour*; And they have made thereof a Spectacle of Devotion, where there is but one Actor, and all the *Faithful* are but Spectatours. The Author of the *Inſtitution* ſaith, *Eat and Drink all*; and at this day, *One* only Eats and Drinks; the Devotion of all the reſt conſiſts only in Regarding and Contemplating. I could ſhew, That there is nothing ſo remote from God's Intention, nothing ſo oppoſite to the Ends for which this Sacrament hath been Inſtituted. But I will only be content to ſay, *That ſuch a Thing, in the Primitive Ages, would have paſſed for a Prodigy.* If there ſhould have been a great Aſſembly of Men, Profeſſing to be *Chriſtians*, in the midſt whereof, at the Celebration of Myſteries, the *Paſtour* only had Eaten; the *Faithful* entring in would have taken them for a Company of *Reprobates*, and for a Church of *Manicheans*, who had in honour the *Creatures of God*, and *Wine* above all. Theſe Gentlemen are too Learned to be ignorant of this Truth. There remains yet a Proof thereof in their Canon

Law,

Law, where we read, *That when Conſecration is finiſhed, all muſt Communicate or be put out of the Church; for the Apoſtles have ſo Ordained, and the* Roman *Church obſerve it ſo.* De *Conſecr.* diſt. 2. & *Diſtinct.*

IV. I have but one Word to ſay, it's about the *Yoke of the Celibat*, which they impoſe on ſo many Perſons in the *Roman* Church. God forbid that we ſhould blame the pure and voluntary *Celibat*: We ſay as St. *Paul*, that it were to be wiſhed that the *Miniſters of the Goſpel* were as *He*; they could ſerve then, both with leſs diſtraction, and with more Zeal, the Glory of God and the Salvation of the Faithful. But we cannot tolerate a Forced *Celibat*, which they impoſe on ſo many Men and ſo many Women, who are engaged either by Inconſideration, or by the Violence of their Superiours into a ſtate, for which they are not fit at all. The deſign of finding an Eſtabliſhment in the World, to have a Benefice whereon they might live, engages the *Prieſts* into the ſaid *Celibat*; and that is done, without having in the leaſt conſulted their Heart and their Conſcience. *In all Families, a Boy muſt be deſtined to the Church, with a proſpect of enriching the Houſe, and putting it into a better Condition.* It is a Point that we can never digeſt, becauſe that this kind of *Celibat*, is an inexhauſtible and inevitable Source of Impurities.

I think now to have done all that Monſieur *de Condom* doth exact from him, that ſhall think it fit to Anſwer his Treatiſe. I have confuted nothing, and proved nothing; I have only explained things, and I believe, that I have Explained with a very great Fidelity, if not with a great Exactneſs and piercing Wit. I have only proved the Three Things, that they

they permitted us to prove. The Firſt, That in thoſe places wherein Monſieur *de Condom* gives an *Idea* of his Religion, as *Sweeter than that which we have*, he doth it not with all that Fidelity whereof he is capable. In other places, where they would *annihilate Diſputes*, what we have ſaid doth clearly ſhew, *That Objections and Diſputes remain ſtill entire*; that is the Second Thing which we were to prove. And finally, From the firſt I have ſhewed, *That the Doctrine of the* Roman *Church deſtroys Foundations*; that is the Third Thing which Monſieur *de Condom* demanded. I Conclude, proteſting, that I regard the Re-union of *Chriſtians*, as the greateſt Good that we can receive from Heaven. We are ready to buy it with the laſt drop of our Blood; but we will never buy it by abandoning our Verities.

FINIS.